R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 018 004 EA 001 205

FEDERAL POLICY AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS, A SERIES OF NINE ESSAYS FOCUSING ON QUESTIONS AND ISSUES AROUND WHICH POLICY EVOLVES.

BY- LINDMAN, ERICK L. AND OTHERS
AMERICAN ASSN. OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

PUB DATE 67
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC NOT AVAILABLE FROM EDRS. 40P.

DESCRIPTORS- #FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, #EDUCATIONAL POLICY, #PUBLIC SCHOOLS, GOVERNMENT ROLE, FEDERAL AID, ENVIRONMENTAL INFLUENCES, TEACHER EDUCATION, AGENCIES, WELFARE PROBLEMS, EDUCATIONAL COORDINATION, TAXES, #EDUCATIONAL FINANCE, EDUCATIONAL QUALITY, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTERS, SCHOOL SURVEYS, PROGRAM EVALUATION, #FEDERAL STATE RELATIONSHIP, CENTRALIZATION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,

THE GROWING IMPORTANCE OF EDUCATION AND THE PERSISTENT AND EMERGING PROBLEMS AND PRESSURES IMPINGING ON SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS LED THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS TO AUTHORIZE PREPARATION OF THE NINE ESSAYS IN THIS VOLUME. EACH ESSAY IS CONCERNED WITH THE GENERAL TOPIC "FEDERAL POLICY AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOL" AND FOCUSES ON QUESTIONS AND ISSUES AROUND WHICH NATIONAL POLICY EVOLVES. THE SERIES IS INTENDED TO PROVIDE A THOUGHTFUL BASIS FOR STUDY AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROBLEMS AND ISSUES INHERENT IN THE CHANGING RELATIONSHIPS AMONG LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT--(1) ERICK L. LINDMAN, "THE SEARCH FOR A NEW ROLE FOR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN EDUCATION," (2) LUVERN L. CUNNINGHAM, "EDUCATION AS AN INSTRUMENT FOR REALIZING NATIONAL GOALS," (3) WILLIAM G. CARR, "WHO MAKES EDUCATIONAL POLICY AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL," (4) RICHARD WYNN, "CENTRALIZING TENDENCIES IN EDUCATION," (5) H. THOMAS JAMES, "EMERGING PATTERNS OF FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION," (6) WILLIAM P. MCLURE, "FINANCING EDUCATION AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL," (7) WENDELL H. PIERCE, "THE IMPACT OF FEDERAL INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATION ON SIGNIFICANT SOCIAL ISSUES," (8) RICHARD A. DERSHIMER, "GIVING DIRECTIONS TO EDUCATION THROUGH RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT," AND (9) GEORGE B. BRAIN AND ERICK L. LINDMAN, "TIME TO EVALUATE FEDERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS." THESE ESSAYS APPEARED IN "THE SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR," SCHOOL YEAR, 1966-1967, AND ARE AVAILABLE FOR $2.00 AS ONE DOCUMENT, STOCK NO. 021-00670, FROM THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS, 1201 SIXTEENTH STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036. (HW)

EA 001 205

Federal Policy and the Public Schools

ED018004

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

PROCESS WITH MICROFICHE AND PUBLISHER'S PRICES. MICROFICHE REPRODUCTION ONLY.

Federal Policy and the Public Schools

PROCESS WITH MICROFICHE AND PUBLISHER'S PRICES. MICRO-FICHE REPRODUCTION ONLY.

Federal Policy and the Public Schools

A series of nine essays
focusing on questions
and
issues around which
policy evolves

Published by the
American Association of School Administrators
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted work has been granted to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and to the organization operating under contract with the Office to Education to reproduce documents included in the ERIC system by means of microfiche only, but this right is not conferred to any users of the microfiche received from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. Further reproduction of any part requires permission of the copyright owner.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Marylane Yingling TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Copyright 1967

American Association of School Administrators.

All rights reserved. No part of this document may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher.

Single copy, $2.00. Quantity orders: 2-8 copies, 10 percent discount; 10 or more copies, 20 percent discount.

Postage charged on billed orders.

Stock Number: 021-00670

The past few years have been exciting ones—perhaps the most eventful in the entire history of American education. Schools have been swept into a whirling vortex of cultural change that has made them a more vital part of the culture and more visible on the local, state, and national scenes than ever before.

As education has become more clearly identified with the nation's well-being, the schools have become more visible in the political arena. Perhaps at no other time in our history has education occupied such a prominent place on the agenda of the United States Congress. The growing awareness of the federal government's responsibility for education reflects a new and evolving national posture. This deeper involvement in community, state, and national life has brought to the schools new challenges, but it has brought, too, perplexing problems and issues that must be viewed and treated with new perspective.

Increasing amounts of federal funds are producing profound changes in the historical roles of the local, state, and national governments, and each level of government is attempting to find its unique role in improving American public education. The partnership that has served America so well must now be re-examined in the light of changing conditions.

September 1966

Number One

Sensitive to the growing importance of education, as well as to the persistent and emerging problems and pressures impinging on school administrators, the Executive Committee of the American Association of School Administrators authorized the preparation of nine essays, one to appear in each issue of THE SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR for the school year 1966-67. All are concerned with the general topic, "Federal Policy and the Public Schools." Each essay focuses on a set of critical questions and issues around which national policy evolves. The series is intended to provide a thoughtful basis for study and understanding of the problems and issues inherent in the changing relationships among levels of government.

This essay, the first of the series, is entitled "The Search for a New Role for the Federal Government in Education." It has been prepared by Erick L. Lindman, professor of education, University of California, Los Angeles, California.

We urge each member of AASA to study the essays carefully, to discuss them with his colleagues, his board of education, his congressional representatives, and interested citizens to the end that American public education will become an even more effective institution through which the American people seek to reach their destiny.

FORREST E. CONNER
Executive Secretary
American Association
of School Administrators

The American public school partnership is a natural outgrowth of our federal system. For it to function effectively, each of the three partners, the local school system, the state, and the federal government, must pursue policies which are mutually supportive and which contribute to the common purpose—better education. With the recent expansion of federal programs in education and the aggressive leadership exerted by the United States Office of Education, a reappraisal of the partnership, especially the role of the federal government, is essential.

Only a few short years ago the accepted goal of nearly all advocates of federal aid for education could be summarized succinctly in these words: federal aid without federal control.

This concept of the federal role was based upon a historic distrust of the concentration of power, whether political, religious, or economic power, or the power to determine how our children should be educated. National control of education is expected in those countries where the government has a social program to sell to its youth. But in America, where diversity and the free marketplace of ideas are the dominant ingredients of our educational system, national controls seemed wholly inappropriate.

Moreover, under local control of education many communities developed excellent school systems. Distinguished citizens accepted positions on local school boards, and local property taxpayers contributed toward the increasing school budget with remarkable generosity. New types of educational programs were pioneered in American cities. All this happened under state and local control of education.

There were, to be sure, inadequate schools in many communities. In most cases these inadequacies could be traced to deficiencies in the local school tax base. The assessed valuation of taxable property per pupil was so low in some communities that school tax rates, far above the average, failed to provide sufficient funds for even a minimum program.

To remedy this deficiency, the states invented new state-aid systems which provided greater amounts of state support per pupil to the low-wealth districts. Along with the effort to improve the financial support for public schools came increased state supervision and efforts to consolidate schools into larger and more efficient school administrative units.

But progress was spotty. Some states made great progress; others lagged far behind. Comparisons among the states revealed shocking differences in the level of education of its citizens. During World War II and during the Korean War, the number of young men who were unacceptable for military service because of educational deficiencies was intolerably great in some states.

Again, a careful examination of the facts revealed that most of the states with inadequate schools were also the states in which the per capita income was substantially below the national average. In general, the people in those states were making as great an effort to finance their schools as were people in other states. They were devoting as large a percentage of their income to the support of schools. But the funds available to the schools were grossly inadequate.

General Federal Aid Indicated

These facts indicated an appropriate role for the federal government: it should provide general support for public schools without federal control, granting larger amounts to low-wealth states, precisely as state governments had done for local school districts. The assignment of this role to the federal government was based upon the assumption that the causes of inadequate schools are basically fiscal and that state and local school leadership exists or can be found that will make wise choices in the use of additional funds.

This view of the basic federal role in the support of public schools was shared by many national leaders in the past, including the late President John F. Kennedy. The recent widely discussed plan to return to the states for general state purposes a portion of the federal income tax collection is based upon the same concept of the federal role in the support of state services.

Despite the strong appeal of the concept of federal general-purpose aid for education without federal control, the recent trend has been toward increased federal control of public school programs through the enactment of numerous special-purpose grant programs. Hundreds of pages of guidelines have been written in the U. S. Office of Education spelling out the conditions under which a school may be eligible for a grant for this purpose or for that purpose. For some of the grants, proposed innovative projects must be submitted to the Office of Education for its approval.

This abrupt shift in federal school policy was accepted by some as an expediency—hopefully temporary in nature—to get needed federal school dollars started. Despite vigorous campaigns by the American Association of School Administrators, the National Education Association, the Council of Chief State School Officers, and allied groups, general federal support for public schools has not been approved by Congress, primarily because of the church-school controversy and the school segregation issue. While it is possible to design federal categorical aids so that the parochial schools receive some benefit, general support funds are necessarily confined to public schools under the American Constitution.

To others, the new emphasis upon categorical aids for education is not a device for getting around historical roadblocks to general federal support funds. Instead, they are part of the "necessary revolution in American education." This view is expressed clearly by the U. S. Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe II, who, in a publication entitled *Education 1965: A Report to the Profession,* declared:

"The 88th and 89th Congresses, responding to the desires of the people, enacted laws enabling the Federal Government to take its place in the local-State-National educational partnership. . . . Toward this end, the Congress has enacted 24 major pieces

f education legislation in the past 3 ears. These new laws are channels hrough which billions of Federal ax dollars will go into our elemenary schools, high schools, vocational chools, colleges, and ur iversities.

"But this money is no. simply handed ut in the pious hope that it will be ut to good use. Each of the educaon laws . . . is quite specific. Cateories and conditions of aid have been stablished to insure that these funds re spent in an efficient and prudent anner."

eing Brutally Frank

This description of the federal role brutally frank. The U. S. Commisioner of Education declares that it is nly a "pious hope" that state and ocal school leaders would put addiional funds to good use and spend hem in an efficient and prudent manner without categories and conditions learly spelled out by federal authoriies.

This new federalism in education ests upon four rather clear premises. irst, it assumes that state and local chool leaders, including state legislaures and local boards of education, will ot spend federal funds prudently and the national interest without specific ederal direction.

Second, it assumes that a series of ederal categorical aids for selected ervices or programs, with accompanyng guidelines, audits, and reports, will esult in better local school manageent.

Third, it assumes that public schools hroughout the nation have uniform trengths and weaknesses which can be emedied by categorical aids applied niformly throughout the nation.

Fourth, it assumes that state and ocal tax sources will provide in the reaining 90 percent of the school budget he funds needed to improve existing rograms and services.

The sharp distinction between the asic philosophy of those who favor ederal aid without federal control and hose who favor the new, highly conrolled, categorical-aid approach is tartlingly clear. During the months and years ahead this issue will be sharply debated as Congress considers expansion of the categorical-aid system or shifts toward "block" grants.

So far we have discussed the question: How can the federal government best aid public schools in discharging their responsibilities? Equally important to an effective local-state-federal partnership is the question: How can the public schools aid the federal government in discharging its responsibilities?

For many years the public schools have carried out educational activities which were intended primarily to support programs and responsibilities of the federal government. Perhaps the most obvious example is the ROTC program, which clearly supports national defense, a responsibility of the federal government. Payments made to schools and colleges for such programs are more properly considered to be payments for services rendered rather than federal aid to education.

Since national defense has been a responsibility of the federal government since the founding of the Republic, classification of federal payments to schools for ROTC programs as payments for services rendered to the federal government instead of aid to education is quite readily accepted.

Exactly the same principles apply, however, to more recently accepted responsibilities of the federal government. For example, Congress has accepted the responsibility for full employment. In the Manpower Development and Training Act, it concluded that "it is in the national interest that current and prospective manpower shortages be identified and that persons who can be qualified for these positions through education and training be sought out and trained, in order that the Nation may meet the staffing requirements of the struggle for freedom. . . ." In the preamble to the Act, Congress goes on to say that it is the responsibility of the federal government "to develop and apply the information and methods needed to deal with the problems of unemployment resulting from automation and technological changes and other types of persistent unemployment." Acceptance of this responsibility by the federal government requires it to support the development of vocational education.

With such responsibility clearly accepted by the federal government, much of the vocational education in public schools can be interpreted as aid to the federal government in discharging its newly accepted responsibility for full employment. Federal payments to public schools for such vocational education may quite properly be interpreted as payments for services rendered rather than federal aid to public schools. Similarly, with acceptance of the federal role in the War on Poverty, much of the expanded public school program for disadvantaged children can be classified as services rendered to the federal government in support of a responsibility accepted by the federal government.

When the problem is viewed this way, it is not always clear under the various categorical-aid programs who is aiding whom.

For example, this aspect of the complex interrelationship between the public schools and the federal government becomes embarrassingly clear when the federal government threatens to cut off federal school aids because of noncompliance under the Civil Rights Act. If, under most of the categorical-aid programs, the public school is actually aiding in the accomplishment of accepted goals of the federal government, cutting off the aid penalizes the intended beneficiaries of the federal program and does not penalize the school district per se. Perhaps we need to give more thought as to who is aiding whom in this interrelationship so that we will not mistakenly deprive children of needed school services.

Through Others' Eyes

With so much confusion in the federal-state-local relationship with respect to education, a fundamental re-examination is urgently needed. For this examination each partner should look at the problem through the eyes of the other partner. It is tempting for federal officers to look at the state and local administrators and say to them: "You

are the problem. If you were competent and cooperative, the necessary revolution in American education would proceed quickly and efficiently according to a national plan."

Likewise, state and local school leaders, struggling to implement new categorical-aid programs, might be tempted to say to the U. S. Office of Education: "On the contrary, you are the problem. You have burdened the schools with mountains of red tape and distorted educational emphases through a multitude of categorical aids."

Hopefully the discussion will not reach such an impasse. Yet the issues are fundamental and they reflect deep-seated convictions based upon widely different personal experiences with education.

Some Important Questions

Instead of indulging in the kind of name-calling that could easily result in this discussion, we need to ask and to answer a series of questions concerning the federal role in education. Here are some of them:

Is some form of federal general-purpose aid or sharing of federal taxes with states needed to strengthen the ongoing public school program in low-income states? In all states? Is there a danger that without federal general-purpose funds, grants for special programs such as vocational education, libraries, or compensatory education will draw limited local funds from equally essential nonaided programs and weaken the total education of young people in the United States?

Should federal tax funds be used to guarantee in each state a level of school support per pupil sufficient to finance a satisfactory basic school program, toward which each state would be required to contribute a prescribed percentage of its total personal income, with the federal government contributing the remainder? This is essentially the approach many states have used to guarantee an adequate basic school program in local school districts.

How can federal contributions to the public schools be so made that school boards will know during the budget-making period how much federal money they will have during the ensuing year? Only by such an arrangement can federally financed programs be planned effectively.

In discharging its newly assumed obligations for full employment, should the federal government provide continuing support for vocational education? If so, should the various laws and appropriations for vocational education be consolidated into a single program, giving greater discretion to state vocational education planning groups?

Should the federal government, as part of its War on Poverty, provide continuing support for special education programs for disadvantaged students? If so, should the various laws and appropriations be combined into a single program, giving greater discretion in the use of those funds to local boards of education?

Is it possible to provide for public schools and parochial schools in separate laws so that different methods and procedures, appropriate to each, can be used? If public schools should be granted federal general-purpose support and if parochial schools should have some benefits for their pupils, is it possible to enact such legislation separately so that each bill will be designed for its special purpose? Much confusion results when an attempt is made to provide for both types of schools in the same legislation.

Should the federal government increase its payments-in-lieu-of-taxes to public schools by reducing the eligibility requirement of Section 3 of Public Law 874? The public schools derive about half of their revenues from property taxation. The federal government is the largest property owner in the United States. If the federal government refuses to pay its local school taxes, a major gap in the local school revenues is inevitable. Should the federal partner meet this obligation?

Should the federal government direct its resources toward the continuous support of education, leaving to private foundations the function of providing "seed money" for the development of innovations? Massive support for innovation by the federal government seems to assume that innovations are available in carload lots.

Should the federal government use the threat of withholding school funds to enforce compliance with national policies? Such threats tend to make it impossible to stabilize federally supported programs and enter into long-term contracts with employees, creating confusion and inefficiency in the very programs the federal government wishes to encourage.

Should the various federal education programs which are scattered among several agencies of the federal government be concentrated in a single agency so that schools will have a single point of contact with the federal government? Much time is wasted as different agencies seek to enter into separate agreements with local school systems. Is it possible to do some streamlining of the federal government to avoid this source of confusion?

Agreement Not Easy

These are but a few of the many questions which must be answered if the local-state-federal public school partnership is to become fully effective. Agreement will not come easily. With respect to education, we are all provincial, basing our convictions upon limited personal experience. For this reason, we are all part of the problem. Perhaps if we try we can all become part of its solution.

October 1966
Number Two

It is comparatively easy for school administrators and school board members to become disenchanted with the extended and severe expectations which are held for the educational enterprise these days. Schools in America, rightly or wrongly, are expected to produce persons capable of passing selective service exams and fighting a war to which the nation has less than a full commitment; to provide raw material to satisfy the active appetites of institutions of higher education; to develop human capital sufficient to meet the sometimes ambiguous and fuzzy demands of an industrial and business-based economy; to produce human organisms that are sensitive, tolerant, respectful, forgiving, and understanding of their fellowmen; and to prepare "citizens"—a sustained flow of men and women committed to the American way of life and the perfection of the processes of democracy.

What does a nation, especially this nation, have a right to expect of its school system? What national goals can and should be realized either directly or indirectly through education? Is it wise to impose responsibilities on an educational system for the attainment of national goals that are clearly not educational goals? Should schools be the only major institution held responsible for the achievement of national objectives?

These and similar questions are being raised these days by school administrators. They are hard, disturbing questions because they challenge the thesis accepted by many American educators: that American schools serve public interests, as defined by the public through the mechanisms for expression available to it. Such questions imply that there should be service boundaries defined for the nation's schools—that limits be imposed on expectations.

In 1960, John W. Gardner, now U. S. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, set down the general responsibility for education in *Goals for Americans:* "Education is essential not only to individual fulfillment but to the vitality of our national life. The vigor of our free institutions depends upon educated men and women at every level of the society. And of this moment in history, free institutions are on trial." Few would quarrel with Gardner's basic thesis, for it expresses rather succinctly the primary aspiration of laymen and professionals for the nation's schools vis-à-vis the society that has spawned them. One can likewise remark at the restraint with which he treated the plight of our free institutions. At the same time, however, there is the implication that the commonweal rests quite directly on our school systems.

Much of today's administrator uneasiness is linked to the fact that prominent Americans seem to see the schools as the key to achieving racially integrated housing, removal of discrimination in employment, reduction of delinquency, stopping the flight of the middle class to the suburbs, improved mental health, and a halt to the deterioration of moral standards. It is clear that the performance of a nation's school system is related to social problems such as these. If schools were more successful with their clientele, there would not be as many dropouts or deviant personalities flagrantly exploiting the social conscience of the society; nor would there be the severe problems of mental health evoked by difficult adjustments to changing environments.

Schools and National Goals

Most thoughtful observers would apply some rough criterion of reasonableness in establishing expectations for any single social institution in regard to national problems or the achievement of national goals in re-

---

This article, "Education as an Instrument for Realizing National Goals," was prepared for *The School Administrator* by Luvern L. Cunningham, director of the Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago. It is the second in a series of nine essays on the general subject, "Federal Policy and the Public Schools."

spect to those problems. The appropriate question is: What can a society reasonably expect schools to contribute to the achievement of national purposes? The schools cannot ignore important national objectives to which they can contribute; nor can they assume complete responsibility for solving the social ills of the times.

To assess our professional posture on education as an instrument for the realization of national goals, it seems useful to apply the criterion of reasonableness to several national goals that have been identified as salient for education.

National Defense

The schools' role in defense was made quite clear in 1958 with the passage of the National Defense Education Act. The Congress, in a somewhat alarmist posture, rushed through legislation designed to strengthen schools in special ways. These ways were selected as responses to shortcomings, particularly in science and mathematics, which American political leaders diagnosed as most threatening to our international competitive position. Even earlier, the large-scale programs of the National Science Foundation likewise gained congressional support on the assumption that such efforts would contribute to a stronger scientific capability for the country, permitting us to keep pace with other nations in a wide range of international scientific and technological competitions.

The most recent reminder that educators received of their defense obligation was the highly publicized criticism of the schools emanating from the Office of the Secretary of Defense. Defense Secretary Robert McNamara chastised teachers for their failure to impart knowledge and for sending students into a mental fog of boredom, confusion, and noncomprehension. The Defense Department has developed schools to repair the loss and make several hundred thousand young men capable of military service who would ordinarily not have been accepted because of low performance on armed forces aptitude tests.

The implications of McNamara's statements are clear: School officials had better go about getting their houses in order immediately.

The national goal, generally stated, is to maintain an adequate defense. The expectations for the schools appear to be at two levels. The first of these is to provide an adequate flow of brain power sufficient to meet the demands of scientific progress in such areas as weapons development, military strategy, and space exploration. The second of these is to ensure a sustained flow of basic muscle power, prepared sufficiently well academically to meet minimum military standards. Is either of these unreasonable? They do not seem to be. The nation is dependent upon brain power and muscle power to protect itself, and the schools are implicitly involved in the supply process.

The schools have not been asked to assume a Spartan posture; most students are not required to learn to march, handle weapons, learn individual defense tactics, develop survival skills, or operate military vehicles. Students could be required to do such things, obviously; courses could be incorporated into the curriculum which would lead directly to strengthened national defense, especially at the muscle level. Such measures have not been seen as necessary or reasonable, but they are available if world conditions dictate.

Serving the defense purpose, then, does not appear to be particularly objectionable. The expectations are rather modest after all and in fact integrate well with other purposes which the schools seek to serve, such as national physical fitness, general cognitive development, and a minimum level of national literacy. The fact that large numbers of young men cannot pass modest military service aptitude examinations should be a concern to teachers and administrators across the nation, for these exams serve as a crude external measure of our school system's performance.

Earlier this year AASA released a book entitled *Imperatives in Education,* which spelled out nine serious responsibilities for the nation's schools. Although labeled imperatives, they are in effect goals for schools, national in scope. The authors of the volume urged American educators to redesign the curriculum in keeping with these imperatives.

Some of the imperatives sound very much like well-known objectives of American education. "To prepare people for the world of work," "To make the best use of leisure time," and "To make intelligent use of natural resources" have a rather familiar and time-honored ring about them. Others do not. "To make urban life rewarding and satisfying," "To deal constructively with psychological tensions," and "To keep democracy working" are of a different flavor. And if we are to take ourselves seriously in regard to these three, we are indeed assuming a frightening but at the same time magnificent responsibility.

The three are obviously interrelated. The task of making urban life rewarding and satisfying will be partially achieved if we are successful through education in providing a basis for each individual to deal with psychological tensions. And the only way we will achieve a revitalization of life in urban complexes will be through a genuine, grass-roots, democratic effort. Anything short of that will be inadequate and casts doubts on whether the other objectives are achievable or indeed worth achieving at all.

Keeping Democracy Working

As a nation we have had nearly two centuries of experience with a republican form of government. Despite a seeming comfort with democratic processes, we continue to struggle to make the system functional. The stresses imposed on all levels of government have been substantial, but the most visible deterioration in capacity to manage problems has been at the local level, especially in urban surroundings.

There are hosts of reasons why local government is in trouble. Part of the difficulties can be attributed to structure—cities seemingly are too large to

treat the range of housing, police protection, education, employment, sanitation, and other matters that plague them daily. There is not enough flexibility in the system; it has become unwieldy and nonresponsive; political access is denied to large segments of the population. Suburbs are frequently suffering from another kind of structural difficulty. In many cases governmental units are too small, impoverished, rapidly growing, experiencing shifts in their populations, and without a responsible leadership structure. The cities are too large and centralized, and their suburban fringes are often too fragmented and diffuse.

When local government fails to solve local problems, it appeals in desperation to state and federal sources for help. Even in the absence of such appeals, state and federal governments increasingly are defining local problems as among the most serious facing the nation and are taking steps to remedy them. Urban renewal, rapid transit, community health, policing, housing, urban planning, and education are a few among dozens of local problem areas that have been entered in the national interest.

What then is the responsibility of the schools in regard to this imperative? How can they help keep democracy working?

The quick and easy answer is to improve our teaching of the structure and processes of government. That has been our response for years when we have concerned ourselves with voter apathy to school bond issues, tax referenda, and other public matters bearing directly on the schools. We have had confidence that if individuals had knowledge of their government, they would be interested and able to make it work. As important as strengthened teaching about government may be, that will not be enough.

The best contribution the schools can make is to provide genuine experiences in the processes of democracy within schools themselves. And this is by no means a new observation. John Dewey appealed to educators to make of schools locations for the exercise of reflective thinking on the part of individuals and groups. He called for schools to be open societies where problems are encountered and solved through the exercise of freedom of thought and expression and majority decision.

If the need for better participation in democracy skills were not pronounced enough within the society at large to cause school leaders to pause, certainly actions within the education community itself should be sufficient to attract our attention. Two bits of evidence are compelling: One is the large-scale unrest among student groups, particularly in higher education but also present in elementary and secondary schools; the other is the restlessness of teachers, manifest in so-called militancy and power-seeking behaviors.

Both of these movements are in part due to the "closed" nature of many local school systems. In most cases no one has deliberately designed them to be closed, and probably the administrators in such situations do not perceive them to be so. But students do and teachers do. They do not see them as places where they have a genuine participatory role in the decisions of the enterprise. Students have a feeling of being acted upon and not with. Teachers have a feeling of being left out or overlooked when important issues are up for consideration—issues which extend far beyond salary and fringe benefit matters and are at the heart of the teaching function.

Administrators need to locate within themselves their feelings about participation on the part of large numbers of persons in the central affairs of schools. If their feelings are that such involvement is not warranted, is troublesome, is awkward, or that there is not time for it, they are in for difficulty from this point forward. If, on the other hand, their feelings are that real participation is important, that there exist extraordinary resources within student and faculty ranks for improving decisions affecting the enterprise, then there is promise for them.

One of the problems of administrators is that they themselves are products of the culture for which they are now assuming responsibility. If they themselves have not had experience in the processes of democracy, it is more understandable why they have not been able to establish the conditions within which open involvement in the central decisions of the organization can be extended to larger numbers of teachers and students.

If our national objective is to keep democracy working, probably the best mechanism for its achievement is the perfection of the school as a laboratory for developing the skills essential to participation in the processes of democracy.

Psychological Tensions

Expecting the schools to deal with the tensions of a nation is a large order, since the conditions producing tension in the society are not under the direct control of the nation's educational system. Even if they were, it would be a staggering assignment for any institutional sector of the society to assume. But this is not to say that schools do not have a responsibility or a part to play in the improvement of society's tension-coping ability.

Schools and classrooms are themselves miniature societies. They have within them reflections of all the tension-producing agents in the larger community. Classrooms in upper-income suburbs as well as inner-city ghetto areas are populated with youngsters experiencing all sorts of emotional upsets. Likewise, the professional staffs of the nation's schools contain persons with their own particular sets of stresses. The parent constituencies of most classrooms have their share of members who are struggling to manage their own brand of tensions. Thus the school, as a particular life environment for a large percentage of the total population, is a superb laboratory for the study of the impact of external forces on human beings. At the same time the school has the best opportunity of any institutional sector to focus on developing emotional strengths which will enable persons to deal effectively with ambiguity and sustained change.

School people have witnessed a progression of boys and girls whose school experience has made little or no contribution to their capacity for living productive and satisfying lives. In many cases we have stood by helplessly as pupils withdrew, regressed, evidenced hostility, or manifested one or more of many forms of alienation from the school society as well as the broader community. We have observed these occurrences knowing that for most of these persons their life chances are zero. We know, too, the cost to the nation of assuming the social burden of such persons for the balance of their nonproductive lives.

There can be no escape from responsibility here. If the society is to survive, the schools must assume a heavier responsibility for preparing persons to live satisfactorily in settings that will become increasingly nonsatisfying, despite affluence and a reduction in abject poverty. We are on the threshold of an era of purposelessness as a nation; we seem to have no clear sense of direction; we have no challenges which are enlisting emotional support from large numbers of people. We seem to be rudderless and drifting. And these circumstances mark the adult community as well as the preadult community.

Obviously such an arena of responsibility may require large-scale rethinking and redesigning of the educational system itself if we are to approach the objective at all. We may need to reconceptualize the school and consider it more as a center for human development rather than as an institution to serve essentially cognitive purposes. In a center for human development, the total needs of the human organism could be addressed in a common setting. The psychological, physical, biological, and cognitive growth patterns could be directed simultaneously, with a new mix of professional talents incorporated into the process.

Making Urban Life Rewarding

Modern urbanization possesses components which may lead to grossly unsatisfactory living for more and more people. Unless we can develop useful strategies to deal with such components, we can hardly look forward to satisfying and rewarding lives for many urban dwellers. On the other hand, urban living is by no means disappointing to large numbers of people. They find the large city or a metropolitan area filled with vitality and richness not available anywhere else.

The responsibility of the school is to enhance opportunities for students to know the positive features in urban living and to expose them to the exciting and satisfying potentials of such life settings. The large-scale problems confronting most megalopolitan centers are so awesome that we permit them to overshadow the positive qualities which can and do exist there.

Taking a cue from Dewey once again, the understandings necessary for satisfactory living in urban settings may be available only through experiencing the urban environment in ways developed through the schools themselves. Dewey believed that the school was obligated to acquaint students with the data which would surround them in their adult lives and to expect that students would have some responsibility for dealing with such data as students. Support for such a position can be drawn from the enthusiasms of teachers' aides, volunteer teenage workers in inner-city projects, returning Peace Corps volunteers, and the hosts of other young persons now involved intensively in urban programs. Such young men and women are treating the realities of urban living. They have learned to examine contemporary urban life styles with all of their variations. They have developed new skills which permit them to intervene positively into the fabric of urban existence. Such potential exists for school people as well. Indeed, some are at work performing community services which are far afield from the normal administrative and teaching expectations and which frequently involve students in bold new acquaintances with urban living.

Again, it appears that such an expectation for the nation's schools is reasonable.

Summation

Much of contemporary social action is directed toward changing environments. The implicit assumption is that changes in environments, educational or otherwise, will lead to desirable changes in individual human beings. This is probably a partially faulty assumption and an over-expectation for the power of environment. The individual must somehow be retained as the principal target for the efforts of the schools. It is the child who must learn to read, cope with anxiety, participate usefully in democratic processes, and appreciate the potentials for life in intense surroundings. To be mindful of independent personages is by no means a new caution, but remains a worthy one.

The nation has a right to expect a great deal of its school system. The public schools belong to the people and exist to serve individual and public interests. A criterion of reasonableness is in order to govern specific expectations for schools in relation to their serving national purposes. Precise specification of the boundaries of the schools' responsibilities would not appear desirable, and school administrators ought to resist such attempts. With social conditions unstable, there is danger in schools becoming overly responsive to poorly defined public objectives. At the same time, there is disadvantage in freezing the schools to purposes that are inappropriate and obsolete.

November 1966
Number Three

The Congress of the United States makes federal educational policy. In the long run, of course, those who elect the Congress can, if they wish, make the federal policy in education, as in all other matters of public concern. Depending on his depth of concern and degree of influence, political and otherwise, the President may have a substantial effect on educational policy made by the Congress. But, in the final analysis, the popularly elected Congress debates and establishes the federal policy for education. It may well be that, on many occasions, the Congress does not perceive and appreciate the consequences on educational policy of a particular congressional decision. This unawareness, however, does not modify the ultimate effect of the decisions taken.

It should be noted that Congress makes educational policy not only by affirmative action, but also by failing to act. Furthermore, the congressional action or inaction does not have to be designated explicitly as "educational" in order to exert profound effects. Legislation on the beginning age of required military service, for example, or legislation about the "war on poverty" or legislation in the area of civil rights may actually have more effect on educational policy than legislation which is called "educational."

Opposite Effects

Congressional action sometimes has policy results that are contrary to the proclaimed purposes of the Congress in its oft-repeated standard clause against federal control. For example, while clearly the way to avoid federal control is through general federal aid to education, the Congress for years failed to enact such legislation. Instead, special aids for various levels and types have been forthcoming. In actuality, therefore, while proclaiming opposition to federal intervention in local and state educational programs, the Congress has held out incentives, in the form of special grants, which have induced local school and college authorities to give special attention to those phases of education which the Congress, presumably in response to public opinion, deems most in need of improvement. The National Defense Education Act is a classic example.

Thus Congress has on numerous occasions in the past substantially controlled educational policy by the very same legislation which proclaimed in its preamble that federal interference would be strictly forbidden. At the same time, by refusing to make grants which could be used to meet local needs as defined by local authorities, Congress failed for years to strengthen the local role in policy making.

From time to time, executive action, either by the President or his agents in the Administration, can affect education apparently independently of Congress. However, the Congress, if it chooses, can effectively cancel or amend such executive action.

The Supreme Court also can establish federal policy through its interpretation of the Constitution. This branch of the federal government has been increasingly concerned with educational policy in recent years.

The foregoing statements may seem to be oversimplified. They are. The obvious next question, of course, is, Who influences Congress in its role of establishing federal educational policy? Here, the subject becomes more complex. The forces that influence the Congress are as varied as the men and women of whom the Congress is composed.

The members of Congress who belong to the same political party as the occupant of the White House tend on the whole to follow the Presidential lead unless sectional mores are violated. Those of the other party tend, with ex-

---

This article, "Who Makes Educational Policy at the Federal Level?" was prepared for *The School Administrator* by William G. Carr, executive secretary of the National Education Association, Washington, D. C. It is the third in a series of nine essays on the general subject, "Federal Policy and the Public Schools."

ceptions to be sure, to oppose Presidential policies or to propose alternatives to them. Basically, political affiliation influences congressional response.

Special Interests

Special-interest groups such as industry, labor, and religious groups, as well as educational organizations, influence Congress in the establishment of federal policy affecting education. The strength of such influence is greatly increased when the members of the group are individually and personally in support of the organization's stated objectives. Few members of Congress are influenced exclusively by personal contacts with Washington-based lobbyists, especially on broad policy questions. Congressmen often turn to such professionals for information, but they respond, when the chips are down, to the "folks back home." More than one educational bill has failed of passage because of the silence of constituents from whom the senators or representatives have not heard. Conversely, thoughtful, specific exchanges of correspondence or conversations between trusted constituents and members of Congress have more than once been the decisive factor in important legislative accomplishment.

The public press makes much ado lately about the "new establishment" which, it is said, is now taking charge of American education. The noun "establishment" infiltrated the language of educational policy making in 1962, when Dr. James Conant wrote Chapter Two of his book, *The Education of American Teachers*. He considered in this chapter the charge that "a national conspiracy" exists to use the processes of teacher education and certification to maintain a teaching corps which "will dependably follow the NEA party line."

Although he reports that this indictment is widely accepted and often reiterated, Dr. Conant also tells us that he regarded it at the outset of his study with considerable doubt. Then, after visiting 16 state capitals, he concludes that his initial doubts were well-founded, although he quickly adds, somewhat obscurely, "I have seen evidence that one could use, with some distortion and considerable oversimplification, to support the charge."

Thus, Dr. Conant brings in a verdict of "suspicious but not guilty" on the charge of conspiracy. He does, however, detect a "loose alliance" of groups concerned with public school education. Some people, he says, have called this alliance an Establishment. From this point on, in his book and in subsequent addresses and articles, Dr. Conant makes the phrase "education establishment" his very own by frequent repetition. It is clear also that he does not use the term as one of endearment or endorsement.

A Changing Establishment

There is, in my opinion, an Establishment in education now, although not in the sinister sense in which the word is used by the minority who would like to become the majority. There always has been an Establishment. The Establishment has changed repeatedly in the past, and it is changing today.

There is no *new* Establishment in American education. There are some new forces which are giving the old Establishment a new look. Let me suggest some of these new forces.

One of them is the growing militancy of the education profession. This militancy is exhibited by superintendents, principals, and supervisors, and especially by classroom teachers.

A second force in the changing pattern of the education Establishment is urbanization. Moreover, the great urban centers are today only beginning their ascendancy in American life and American education. During the next generation, two-thirds of America's population growth will occur in about 50 large metropolitan areas; density of population in the central cities will increase; suburban areas will spread until they meet the growing suburbs of nearby cities. Thus, the Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago, Detroit, and Washington metropolitan areas will grow until they are at least as big as New York City is now. Such urban areas are sure to have an increasing share in the political, social, and educational life of the American states. The Supreme Court decision on legislative reapportionment did not create this trend, but it will expedite it.

In educational organizations, the influence of the big cities has been indirect but powerful. Urban teachers have formed organizations to formulate policy and to secure its adoption by the public and by the organized profession.

A third new element in the education Establishment is the growing activity in the federal government. Government has become far larger and more complex than it was even a quarter of a century ago. This is true not only of the federal government, but also of the public education system itself; it is true also of institutions like organized labor, organized business, and the organized teaching profession. The older ones among us look back wistfully to a time when everything was more simple, when the process of moving from policy to action was more direct. The younger ones, who do not have the same feeling about the "good old days"—not yet, anyway—nevertheless tend to be impatient with the complexities of the democratic process today.

Foundation Administrators

Another new element has been introduced into the Establishment—the new type of foundation administrator. The ability to dispose of substantial sums of money is always a source of potential power. The foundation administrator, old style, had his own self-imposed restraints on the use of this power. He was required by his job to decide whether to give or to withhold funds. That heavy responsibility he could not escape. But he stopped, as a rule, at that point.

The foundation administrator, new style, has seen his responsibility in a different light. He not only has given and withheld; he also has supervised, reviewed, evaluated, suggested, and urged. He has been inclined to be impatient of the status quo and to equate novelty with wisdom. His test of the value of an idea, an experiment, or a project has often seemed to be whether or not it is "exciting." In his pursuit of excitement, he has not paused to ask whether some good result may be thus

lost or some unfortunate result achieved. If you take him at his word, he has been chiefly concerned with escaping from boredom. He has been apt to conclude that a policy which has been operating for several years must be part of the "conventional wisdom," and to see in its longevity proof certain that it is an error. He has given little attention to the values of established procedures, and has been highly skeptical—sometimes with justice—of any attempt to bring about change within the framework of existing institutions. If he found himself unable to trust anyone to spend acceptably the resources he controls, he has employed a staff and carried on the operation under his own direct supervision; or if this seemed like too great a departure from tradition, he has set up and generously financed subsidiary corporations, with directors and staff of his selection, to carry his policies into effect. The forces thus created have been potent and remain potent indeed—although, I hasten to add, not necessarily harmful.

Teacher Education

Still another effort to exercise educational control seeks new controls over teachers. An excellent example is afforded by the proposal put forth by Dr. Conant in 1963 to entrust control of teacher education to the colleges and universities. At the same time, he would remove, or greatly curtail, the influence of public agencies responsible to public opinion. The states, under this plan, would continue to certify teachers, but only in a legal and almost automatic manner, on the basis of requirements prescribed by each college and university.

These are some of the factors which can exert a major influence on the Congress and on the 42 federal administration agencies that are now involved, in one way or another, in education. Their influence on the formation of federal policy depends in part on their influence on each other—and on the public. Little purpose is served in impugning the motives of those who seek power within the Establishment and who thus exert major influence on the Congress. Proposals affecting educational policy, whether from within or without the Establishment, should be judged on their merits rather than on their origins, on their promise of success rather than on their novelty. Education can, in fact, be strengthened by continuous and open dialogue among those who move in and out of the Establishment. The organized education profession has a major responsibility to see that such dialogue continues to flourish.

Since boards of education are technically state officials, school board members should advise state legislative bodies of the schools' needs and of the state's responsibility for financial support and for providing laws which promote better schools.

A school board member loses his effectiveness and becomes a community liability when he permits personal affiliations and special interests to dim his ardor for public schools.

Since boards are representatives of all the people, they should not yield to pressures from individuals, special interests, or minority groups. At all times, however, the rights of the individual should be preserved.

Boards of education have the right and the responsibility to be informed continuously of the conditions which exist in the schools and the degree to which the goals are being met.

Boards of education should use every suitable avenue of communication to explain the worth of education to the public and to give dignity and prestige to teaching.

We Believe This About the Professional Staff

We believe the school administrator and his colleagues should be professionally prepared and possessed of leadership qualities and the power and courage to make wise decisions. Relationships between the educational staff and the board of education should be characterized by mutual respect and trust.

The professional personnel must be professionally prepared for its diversified and complex tasks, but continuous study, experimentation, and inservice growth are imperative. Encouragement to grow and favorable conditions for growth are the responsibility of the administration and board, but improvement is the responsibility of the individual employee.

Professional staff members should have a living and a saving wage commensurate with their preparation and their complex and difficult professional tasks.

Although job security is important, incompetents should be helped to succeed or dismissed through ethical procedures.

The profession has a clear responsibility to give objective information to boards of education and to the public relative to the degree to which the purposes of education are being achieved and to acquaint them with the methods and procedures used.

The profession will be respected and supported to the degree that it exerts strong and concerted leadership toward American ideals and a positive dynamic education program that will guarantee their achievement.

December 1966
Number Four

Alexis de Tocqueville, the astute French political scientist who visited our young republic in 1831, reported his observations of American life in his brilliant treatise, *Democracy in America.* Few things struck him more forcibly than the decentralization of political power in America. Although he spoke of certain "disgraceful blemishes" arising from this, he concluded that "the political advantages which the Americans derive from their decentralized system would induce me to prefer it to the contrary plan." De Tocqueville marveled at the American's sense of personal responsibility, interest, pride, and enlightenment in the affairs of his nation and attributed this to popular participation in decentralized government.

In no other public affair has the American faith in local control been more notable than in education. Today the power of decision over public education is shifting rapidly from the state and the local level to the federal level and from the old educational establishment to a new, more highly centralized one. It is essential that we reflect on the causes and the consequences of these centralizing tendencies in education.

Causes of Centralization

Shortly after mid-twentieth century, two dramatic events generated powerful thrust toward reallocation of power over public education. When Russia preceded this nation in the exploration of outer space, we looked to our schools as both the cause of our embarrassment and the salvation of our pride. (Curiously, when our own space effort later surpassed the Soviets', no one insisted that our schools take the credit.) The butcher, the baker, and the submarine maker quickly identified the villains and had surprisingly simple and unequivocal remedies readily at hand. Few bothered to note that as late as 1949 Conant had expressed his "fear that we may educate more doctors, lawyers, engineers, scientists, and college professors than our economy can support."

A few years later the civil rights movement called attention to the problems of undereducation, underemployment, and underprivilege of some of our citizens. The Great Society turned to education as the fountainhead of progress in the improvement of the great problems of our times.

When the new reformers finally perceived that more technological talent was needed and that the right kind of schooling could relieve the great social problems, strong new forces were unleashed on the educational scene. The problems of defense and civil rights were both national; the nation turned to the federal government for increased financial support for its schools. The old educational establishment, whose pleas for increased federal support for education during the great depression, the Second World War, and postwar eras had been unheeded, were now joined by a new educational establishment, and greatly increased federal subventions were enacted.

The new federal aid programs, which were still categorical rather than general purpose, brought with them a plethora of specifications and guidelines that introduced indirect but nevertheless powerful controls on educational development. The great diversity of education, which had characterized local control of education, was evidently antithetical to the equality of educational opportunity demanded by the civil rights movement. Most of the old objections to federal influence were swept aside and a new configuration of more centralized power emerged. Let us examine this new system of power.

The sudden availability of substantial federal funds allocated to schools through state departments of education

---

This article, "Centralizing Tendencies in Education," was prepared for *The School Administrator* by Richard Wynn, professor of education, University of Pittsburgh, and president, Associated Educational Consultants, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. It is the fourth in a series of nine essays on the general subject, "Federal Policy and the Public Schools."

has raised the level of influence of state agencies over local school districts. Title V funds of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act are strengthening state departments of education and giving them a heretofore unknown affluence as well as greater independence from the state treasury and stronger bargaining power with other state agencies. The old systems of checks and balances within state infrastructures may soon become obsolete.

Ceremonial Intermediaries?

On the other hand, some local school districts have developed a tendency to deal directly with Washington through their congressmen in the politics of grantsmanship. This consequence is particularly evident where state departments have been sluggish and when federal aid programs permit unilateral relations between the local district and the federal agency administering the money. Many state departments will have to redevelop their structure, activities, and relationships with Washington, as well as with local districts, or become ceremonial intermediaries in the local district-Washington axis.

Although it is far too early to assess the impact of the Compact for Education upon federal-state-local relations, the Compact appears to have great appeal, particularly to governors and legislators, both as a coalition against the centralizing influence of the federal government and as a hedge against the old educational establishment. Despite repeated official disclaimers to the contrary, it is quite possible that the Compact for Education may itself wield the centralizing influences to which it is ostensibly opposed. It may pose a direct threat to existing local-state-federal policy-making mechanisms. At the other extreme, it may be reduced to helplessness by the internal bickering of its constituents. The returns are not yet in.

This writer's prescience does not permit confident judgment of the impact that the research and development centers and the regional educational laboratories will have upon the power structure in education. These centers and laboratories may become centrifugal forces by disseminating a variety of innovations and alternatives upon which school systems may reach decisions. It is important to ask, but too early to answer, the question of the extent to which the regional educational laboratories and research and development centers will bypass state departments of education and thereby alter local district-state relationships.

The most powerful centralizing tendencies in education are clearly at the national level. This centralization appears to be an inevitable consequence of several forces: the growing incapability of state and local government in dealing with pervasive social problems that often transcend state and local jurisdictions; the far greater yield of the federal tax structure and the readiness of the Great Society to finance social services from the public sector of the economy; wondrous advances in technology and communication which permit more efficient programing, but through fewer loci of control; and of course the growing recognition that education can become a powerful instrument of national policy and purpose.

A Wealth of Agencies

These forces have created a pervasive but not pernicious array of public and private agencies: agencies of the federal government, education associations, philanthropic foundations, national curriculum programs, national testing programs, accrediting associations, and industrial combines engaged in the production of educational hardware.

Campbell and Bunnel in their monograph, *Nationalizing Influences on Secondary Education,* concluded that the National Defense Education Act, the College Entrance Examinations, the National Merit Scholarship Program, and the National Science Foundation, among others, have had a standardizing influence upon secondary curriculums and have precipitated a shift in decision making from the local-state to the national level. This shift results, not from new legal arrangements, but because these national enterprises tend to supersede state and local efforts. States still have plenary power over educational policy making; local districts still function as the operating agencies of the state; the classroom teacher still enjoys a high degree of autonomy in determining the scope of his instruction and his method.

The most profound centralization in educational policy making has resulted from the laws of the Eighty-Ninth Congress. These acts have grown out of crisis-oriented considerations and have produced categorical aid for specific objectives born of political considerations and unrelated to considerations of broad national policy in education.

The objectives are often poorly related to those educational purposes, valid or otherwise, held by state and local jurisdictions. Their special-purpose character permits state and local authorities to view them as a conglomeration of projects rather than fundamental parts of a coherent total educational program.

This view is reinforced by the specifications ("innovative" and "exemplary" are especially fashionable) established by the Office of Education and other federal agencies processing project applications, by guidelines governing the administration of the projects, and by criteria by which results are evaluated. These specifications, guidelines, and criteria, however well-intentioned, are frequently restrictive and antagonizing to state and local authorities. Although the legislation prominently disavows federal control of education and U. S. Commissioners of Education speak of the federal government's "junior partnership" in the educational enterprise, the indirect control manifest in the specifications and guidelines is compelling.

Indeed, special-purpose aid, which provides massive largess for special sectors of schooling, is in itself a form of federal control over the development of education. This is not to suggest that federal financial support for education has been nefarious or ineffective; it does suggest that congressmen and bureaucrats in Washing-

ɔı now exercise powerful control over ducation.

The impact of national associations f educators on the centralization of ower over education has probably een overestimated by many observers. he education profession, unlike the ther professions, is characterized by a lethora of voluntary associations that ften hold opposing views on impor- ant matters of policy and strategy.

Welfare Issues

Although the associations make requent pronouncements on educa- ional policy, their lobbying energies re more easily and more effectively roused over matters of professional ights and conditions of employment. They tackle such issues as professional egotiation, minimum salaries, and enure with far more determination and single-mindedness than they do state-church relations and desegrega- tion. Their constituencies are large and often divided on matters of broad policy, making it difficult for their leaders to speak with conviction.

The invasion of the U. S. Office of Education by the new establishment has severed the old linkage between that agency and the National Educa- tion Association and reduced the influence of the latter. Although pro- fessional educators still exercise sig- nificant influence upon educational policy and practice, they exert their power more through their state affil- iates of the National Education Asso- ciation and through their professional practice at the local level.

Regional and national associations that accredit teacher education institu- tions have been criticized for placing unjustified power in the hands of a few. The Mayor study for the National Commission on Accrediting gave little comfort to the teacher education accrediting associations' critics. Al- though the study made several recom- mendations for the improvement of the structure and operation of these associations, it reported no concern over centralization of power in these bodies and expressed faith that the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education and the regional associations could do much to stimu- late improvement and innovation in teacher education.

Many observers have expressed concern over the centralizing tenden- cies manifested by philanthropic foun- dations active in the support of school improvement. Others have insisted that the foundations, by virtue of their number and the diversity of their commitments, have had an opposite effect. In either case, it seems reason- able to conclude that the advent of many regional educational laboratories and research and development centers and other agencies active in educational improvement will tend to dilute and supersede the influence of the founda- tions and relieve whatever centraliza- tion of influence the foundations may once have enjoyed.

The most powerful potential force toward centralization of power over educational practice and policy rests with the huge industrial producers of educational hardware and "software" now entering the field of educational technology.

These mighty industrial combines are well-staffed, well-financed, well- organized, and unencumbered by in- articulate or modest salesmen. Their market has been stimulated by a substantial infusion of federal money for the purchase of the hardware and by the U. S. Office of Education's authorization to contract with private industry for research and ultimately probably for the training of researchers.

Dangerous Partnership

Although schools should use the new technology that holds promise for better instruction, the potential danger of industry and government controlling education is formidable, particularly if the systems approach with its con- centration of power in the hands of a few is used.

Fortune Editor Charles Silberman cautions that "rarely have U. S. cor- porations assumed a role so fraught with danger for the society, as well as for themselves, or so filled with responsibility and opportunity. For over the long run, the new business- government thrust is likely to trans- form both the organization and the content of education, and through it, the character and shape of American society itself."

Many critics of American education have inveighed against the concentra- tion of power over education in the hands of a professional "educational establishment," a term often used in a pejorative sense. The professional educational establishment is described as an interlocking directorate compris- ing professors of education, state and local school administrators, officers of teachers associations, and "the rest of the public school crowd." It is viewed by its critics as a conservative, arro- gant, self-serving, exclusive, and un- official club that is unresponsive to the needs of our time.

Whatever the merits of these charges, it is apparent that a new lay (some call it "amateur") educational establishment has deftly and swiftly displaced the professional establish- ment in many seats of power. This new establishment, far smaller in member- ship than the old, is Eastern, Ivy League, and, as Broudy sees it, given to "an ill-conceived spirit of elitism, intellectual snobbery, and impatience with the limitations of the common man." Its members are more at home in the chambers of the philanthropic foundations, college boards of trustees, and the Council of Foreign Relations than in Kiwanis, Rotary, or the Na- tional Education Association.

They have rarely held local or state administrative positions in public school systems and seldom held de- grees in education. They insist that education is too important to be left to the educators. They speak more of excellence than of democracy in edu- cation, or, at best, of a Hamiltonian rather than a Jacksonian view of democracy. They urge a program of national assessment of education, a revolution in education, and give the impression that all respectable thought in education has taken place within the last decade and by academicians rather than educationists. They appear to have given up on local districts and perhaps even states as viable and effec- tive units of policy making and plan- ning.

They turn for advice, not to the people, but to the academician. They look to the Ivy League colleges for their model of excellence and to the science-based technology for their model of procedure. Their style of leadership is charismatic and oligarchical rather than populist. Their literary style is exhortative rather than conceptual. They have ready access to the largess of the foundations, the political power of the federal government, and the technological capacity of the education industry. They enlist on occasion the services of the abler members of the professional educational establishment to strengthen their new power structure and weaken the old.

Unlike the professional educational establishment, their numbers are small and compact, they are unencumbered by constituencies, and they seldom occupy positions in which they are held legally accountable to the citizenry. Their power is substantial, growing, and highly centralized. There should be no doubt about their integrity and high purpose. They have made a substantial contribution toward the improvement of our educational system.

However one might view the centralization of influence in the contemporary educational scene, certain fundamental questions are inescapable. There is the evident question, Who shall decide? Should education be under the control of all of the people through *de jure* federal, state, and local boards, or should control be vested in extralegal bodies in substantial measure?

Associations' Role

Clearly, various voluntary associations and special-interest groups, such as the National Education Association, the Carnegie Corporation, the National Academy for Education, and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, have made and will continue to make contributions toward the improvement of education. But their role should be in the realm of study, contemplation, stimulation, and counsel. Political power, however indirect and well-intentioned, should not be vested in agencies not accountable to the people.

Like de Tocqueville, this writer believes that control of the government of education must be held by all of the people if it is to serve and enlighten them in a manner essential to a free society. We have often spoken of popular control of education as the laboratory of democracy. Perhaps the surrender of the citizens to the national planner in so many realms of public affairs is a more disturbing trend than the centralization of political power. If our people are to continue that sense of personal responsibility, interest, pride, and enlightenment which so impressed de Tocqueville, their voice in public affairs, especially in education, must not be denied.

How should public control of education be distributed among the various levels of government? Hopefully, we are moving toward a national federalism in which federal, state, and local agencies share.

It seems indisputable that state and federal governments will and should participate increasingly in the educational enterprise. It will accomplish little to spend our energies trying to maintain an obsolete distribution of power.

But if federal control is to be avoided, the state and local educational agencies must be improved and their leadership strengthened to render unnecessary federal incursions designed to ameliorate educational neglect. A well-defined national policy on education is long overdue. Spasmodic, crisis-oriented federal legislation, with its often unanticipated and sometimes unfortunate dislocations of federal-state-local relations, must be supplanted by a coherent, rational, long-range plan for the general improvement of the nation's schools.

The proliferation of federal agencies engaged in the administration of educational programs should be reduced. Categorical federal subventions with their stultifying specifications and guidelines must be supplanted by general-purpose aid for use by the states at their discretion to meet not only national problems but to solve also their own problems, which vary widely among the states. It is incumbent upon all of us to lay aside vested interests and help mold national goals and policies for maximum benefit to the nation.

Can a rapprochement between the professional and the lay educational establishments be achieved? Clearly both have a unique and essential contribution to make toward the improvement of education. But both have failed to reach a comprehensive concept of education adequate for our times. Their valuable energies should not be dissipated in polemics or jurisdictional disputes but addressed rather to the search for integrated and unifying principles of leadership that include both and transcend either.

Education for What?

Finally, can we address ourselves wisely and forthrightly to the question of purpose in education? The most central issue in education in our time, as it was in Spencer's time, is education for what? Contemporary educational development is preoccupied with programs and projects rather than with purposes; with form rather than substance; with methodology rather than objectives. We have become entranced with the technology at the expense of the philosophy.

We have built almost a holy crusade around the word "innovation." But innovation can be for the worse as well as for the better. We must learn to speak of "improvement" rather than "innovation" because improvement places upon the innovator the responsibility for making explicit the criteria of goodness, the purpose, and the superiority of the change over the practice or the program which it displaces.

Many of our disputes in education are spurious until the prior question of purposes is examined. The essential question in education is not the centralization of power, but how power can be allocated and exercised for the greatest fulfillment of society's purposes.

The control of public education in the United States is so broadly diffused that serious attempts to study the phenomenon may be unprofitable. To begin the study is to despair that anything useful or sensible can come of the effort. Much of what I find written on the subject, and most of what I hear said, generates much heat, but little light. I therefore assume that while there is little likelihood that I can reduce the heat or increase the light, certainly there is no chance at all if I stay within the limits of conventional thinking about the subject.

A Loaded Word

The difficulty arises because the term "control" is loaded by a pervasive value judgment that government control of education is bad, and that if left to themselves, without government interference, the people will keep good schools, in spite of all the evidence to the contrary. As long as people hold to these beliefs, they react blindly and negatively to any suggestion of government control of education, at any level, for any purpose at all.

To suggest that such a reaction is irrational because it runs contrary to our general belief in the desirability of representative government and social order, or to point out that the viewpoint is essentially anarchistic, or even to suggest that the processes by which people reach local agreements on schools often exemplify the essence of representative government, simply serves to intensify the argument.

One useful and sensible question to ask, if one seeks to increase the light on the subject of control, is: To what ends do those who would control educational processes seek to guide those processes? Useful insights emerge when our history of education is reviewed in a search for answers to such a question.

It will perhaps also be useful to make a distinction between education and schooling, for many of the aims we deal with are achieved, not by educating the child through increasing his knowledge, broadening his interests, sharpening his perceptions, encouraging his curiosity, and urging him to seek new experience, but by schooling the child to patterns of beliefs and behaviors designed to make him exactly like his parents, or exactly like some model built out of the consensus of a legislature, the Congress, an established church, a committee of teachers, or some other group bent on perpetuating a set of beliefs and behaviors.

Schools in our American society were established through local agreement and consensus long before state school systems were organized and before the emergence of any federal interest in education. Schools were established in our small early communities to transmit the culture, to preserve the social values that defined communities, to cultivate the accepted religious beliefs, and to preserve all the ideas about how citizens should govern themselves that were important to the establishment of those communities.

Later, school systems developed in the young and more heterogeneous cities in response to the simple conviction that children should be kept out of the way of city business, and away from the evil influences of the city streets. Schools were also encouraged by those leaders urging us toward self-government, because if the new nation was to prosper, then the citizenry must be educated to the means and the aims of self-government.

Local schools generally were well established before state governments became involved in their administration. The concerns state legislatures most frequently expressed were for standardization of educational services and for equalization of educational opportunities. These concerns led to elaborate systems for certification of teachers, to standardization of curricu-

January 1967
Number Five

This article, "Emerging Patterns of Federal, State, and Local Control of Education," was prepared for *The School Administrator* by H. Thomas James, dean, School of Education, Stanford University, Stanford, California. It is the fifth in a series of nine essays on the general subject, "Federal Policy and the Public Schools."

um, and to attempts to equalize the financial resources available for the support of education in different localities.

The federal government was a latecomer to educational policy making, but its purpose is perhaps more consistent, and easier to trace over the past century, than either state or local purposes. That consistent purpose has been to increase productivity, first through land grants to colleges of agriculture and mechanics, then to vocational schools, and more recently through encouragement for improvement of the courses essential to technological advances, such as mathematics and science.

It is perhaps too great an oversimplification to say that locally formulated definitions of the task of the school are heavily oriented toward stability and transmission of traditional culture; that the states are concerned with standardization of schools and with equalization of educational benefits and the tax burdens that support them; and that federal concerns are with manpower training, national productivity, and technological innovation.

Illuminating the Boundaries

Yet by attempting such an oversimplification, one can illuminate boundaries, not otherwise so readily discernible, that separate the aims of education defined in one homogeneous community from those of another community, between state legislatures and local communities, among states, between states and the federal government, and indeed between the federal government and local communities.

For instance, one need give only a little thought to the matter to conclude that neighborhood elementary schools would serve quite different expectations in an upper-middle-class suburb of San Francisco, a predominantly Roman Catholic village in the Fox River Valley of Wisconsin, an all-Negro suburb of Los Angeles, a middle-class Jewish suburb of Boston, a predominantly Norwegian farm community of northeastern Iowa, a Baptist settlement in a remote valley of the southern Appalachian region, a predominantly Negro community in the Mississippi delta, a Polish suburb of Chicago, a Mexican community along the Rio Grande, a Pueblo Indian community in the Southwest, an Athabascan community in Alaska, and a Hawaiian Homes community on Oahu.

To argue that a teacher could move freely across schools serving such diverse expectations is to concede that such a teacher's experience and mode of teaching would be largely irrelevant to the purposes the local people expected the school to serve in many if not most of the communities such a teacher would work in. Furthermore, the school that pleased one community would, if transported bodily with building, teachers, and materials of instruction intact, almost certainly outrage virtually every other community; the surest way to increase the outrage would be to include half the pupil population from one community when the school was moved to another.

Thus we can see by such an illustration how relative is the term "good school." The school that is viewed as good by the criteria of one community may be an outrage to public decency when judged by the criteria of another community.

When populations as diverse as those in the communities just illustrated are mixed together in heterogeneous communities, several things may happen. If different groups are reasonably equal, transactional agreements are worked out, and though the interests of some may be advanced at the expense of others, some community of interest emerges with respect to the basic goals of education. The schools may become less attentive to the transmission of a totality of cultural characteristics, in that the specifics of sectarian religions, ethnic traditions, and moral training may give way to greater emphasis on the tools of communication and the general values and history of the nation and of Western civilization. Groups especially aggrieved because their views are not given effect in the public school arrangements may establish private schools.

The state legislature may powerfully reinforce one or another of the social groups competing to control the definition of the task of the school, and thereby give quite different characteristics to state school systems. In general, however, the principal function of the state appears to have been in the enforcement of minimum standards in school housing, in materials of instruction, and in qualifications of teachers. The most sensitive point of local control, and the last that parents patronizing a given school will give up, is the right to select or at least to veto who shall teach. Yet the first and most pervasive power assumed by the states as the state school systems developed was the power to limit local freedom by requiring the systems to choose teachers certified by the state.

States also have extended two kinds of fiscal controls, one set designed to assure prudential handling of school funds, and the other to assure equitable sharing of the benefits and costs of education. The prudential controls rarely are cited by those who deplore state control; even federal prudential controls are generally accepted, though the "red tape" involved at both state and federal levels is a constant source of irritation and protest.

The set of controls aimed at equalizing educational benefits and costs is the most persistent focus of conflict and political action in the entire field of education. The conflict arises because the communities most in need of educational services generally are the ones least able to afford them, and may also be the most apathetic and least able to organize the political power necessary to obtain state action to aid them. Conversely, those communities most able to support educational services are also most able to organize and use political power to protect their resources for their own use.

Invoking the Shibboleth

The result is that enormous difficulties are encountered in shaping broadly beneficial social policy for education, and that the shibboleth of local control is invoked to perpetuate great disparities in the quality of educational services, and great disparities, too, in the tax burdens necessary to support those services.

One of the reasons these inequities are so persistent in the United States is that so many legislatures have granted local agencies the power to tax property for school purposes in terms of tax rates, and thereby have made grants of power which are unequal because they are proportional to the per capita valuation of property. Through much of this century we have devised formulas for distributing unequal proportions of sales and income tax receipts to local districts to equalize the great inequities resulting from these unequal grants of power to levy local taxes.

Resisting Taxes

Since these inequities tend to disappear as the size of the district increases, the reorganization of school districts also has been pursued vigorously in many states. Much of the bitterness generated by reorganization efforts can be ascribed to resentment over threats to privileged tax positions; districts most privileged under existing arrangements invariably resist reorganization most vigorously and, because the resources they possess are generally effective in generating political power and influence, they are more often than not successful in resisting reorganization. Part of their success is certainly due to the value attached to decentralized school systems by people generally, but much of the discussion of "local control of schools" is really about local resistance to taxation.

A more rational and effective method for reducing these inequities than either the state aid formulas or the reorganization of districts would be reassertion by the state of its authority to tax property. This would leave undisturbed what remains of the highly valued local control of school policy. Legislatures would simply reclaim a part of the taxing power they delegated to local districts, by establishing a state-wide rate to be levied on all property for the support of schools. The yield would be drawn into the state treasury and, after being combined with revenues from income, sales, and perhaps other tax sources, would be distributed to accomplish educational purposes stipulated by the legislature.

If additional purposes were to be defined locally, the local agency would still have local taxing power to finance them; whether or not to make the additional tax effort would be decided by the local voters. The general effect would be to equalize among districts the tax burden for those school purposes defined by the legislature and to put in the hands of the legislature the decision as to what mix of income, sales, and property taxes is desirable for the support of schools. A valuable side effect would be better state supervision of the chronically bad and frequently scandalous local administration of property taxes.

Reductions of inequities in the way the costs of education are shared among districts would leave untouched great inequities among states. Most of us who have studied the field of school finance in this century have continued to hope that the federal government would attend eventually to these kinds of inequities, but to date it has not done so in any systematic way.

Furthermore, some very substantial inequalities in educational services persist within large school districts. This is one of the more disturbing findings of many recent studies, notably Hauser's and Havighurst's in Chicago, Odell's in Philadelphia, Coleman's (*Equality of Educational Opportunity*, U. S. Office of Education, 1966), and my own study in the 14 largest cities (*Determinants of Educational Expenditures in Large Cities of the United States*, Cooperative Research Project 2389, U. S. Office of Education, 1966), as well as another soon to be released by the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights.

The degree to which quality of educational services may vary even within a large school district is indeed shocking. If eventually we are to get at the great inequities that concern a large part of our population, we will need to deal more rationally with the phenomenon of local control, for the notion of local control, in some instances powerfully reinforced by state government, is a potent force supporting the status quo. Schools mirror their communities; and until the social values that determine what the communities want for their schools can change, it is unrealistic to expect the local schools to change, for if they do, they lose their clientele.

The federal presence in educational policy has until recently made little impression on local schools, for the vocational interest, the concern for manpower training historically expressed by that presence, had little impact on the secondary schools and virtually none on elementary schools. Even the efforts to improve instruction in science and mathematics supported by the National Science Foundation and later by the National Defense Education Act have done little to disturb the status quo, since the minor changes in materials of instruction and the even less perceptible changes in teaching methods were readily accommodated in most communities without significant negative reactions.

The Expanding Presence

The federal presence became disruptive to comfortable local arrangements for education, however, with the decision to make integration of the races in the public schools a condition of federal financial support. At this writing, my impression is that since that decision was made, the number of children in classrooms segregated by race has increased, not alone because of the increase in segregated populations, but because the proportion of children in segregated classrooms is increasing.

The federal presence is also evident in the assistance given to American industry to open up new markets by expanding a technology for education. I find it awesome to contemplate the number of geniuses now at work trying to find some educational uses for hardware invented for other purposes. It is perhaps instructive to note that a high U. S. Office of Education official was reported in a recent Washington *Monitor* (November 24, 1966) as listing four attributes of good hardware for education: "reliable," "simple to operate," "economically feasible," and (in last but hopefully not least position) "offers a useful function."

$50 Billion To Spend

The word seems to be going out to the schools that they are expected to buy $50 billion worth of hardware in the next decade, and that they should get busy and figure out how they are going to use it. I have no doubt that $50 billion worth of equipment would help improve education in this country; my plea is that we put the geniuses to work studying the education process, as some few of them are doing, and asking, not, "What can this piece of equipment I happen to have too much of do for education?" but, "Given present needs and opportunities in education, what kind of equipment might I invent that would be useful?"

Wanted: Bigger Storerooms

Unless the latter question gets attended to, we will have to build even larger storage rooms for unused hardware than we already have (and one has to see what we have to believe it!) or invent some new kind of disposal unit to grind it.

The more general concern about the federal presence in educational policy is not so much that it may emphasize the training of manpower at the expense of the education of man, or that it may disrupt traditional relations among ethnic and religious groups, or that it will inundate the schools with a dehumanizing technology, though certainly such concerns are abundantly in evidence; rather, the general concern is that the federal power, once made uniformly effective over education, will be used to propagandize for a political ideology and to condition everyone to a particular way of life, to thought control, and to preparation for the totalitarian state.

With so awesome a devil to conjure with, it is not surprising that he gets invoked whenever a tradition or a vested interest is threatened, or whenever even the most minor state or federal bureaucrat visits some petty insolence on the populace.

One can take the philosophic position that though we may deplore the degree to which the notion of local control impedes innovation and improvement, we may also deplore those who pursue innovation and change as an end. Clearly, we have those among us who urge us to leap around sharp corners to positions we cannot see, and such people need to be urged to discuss fully the purposes they pursue rather than imposing them either on easily persuaded individuals or on the society.

Perhaps the extended discussions required to gain some improvement in education in the face of entrenched proponents of local control are not too great a burden to impose on those who now manipulate the billion-dollar levers aimed at changing our economic, social, and political arrangements through change in our education system. Some fairly extended sessions of sitting down and reasoning together seem justified in the light of such substantial purposes.

February 1967
Number Six

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 has led to an intervention of the federal government in the direct management of public schools to an unprecedented extent, resulting in extensive confusion and disunity throughout the educational system. The approach to massive federal support through categorical aids is proving what most leaders and students of education predicted: a cumbersome method that does violence to long-established principles of administration by an enlightened profession.

The root of the problem lies in the method of distributing federal funds for specific purposes with concomitant controls. More than 80 types of grants are in force, a scale of operation that has produced an unbelievable amount of frenetic activity throughout the educational system. The proven methods of evaluating, weighing alternatives, and establishing criteria for balancing related programs and services, have been turned upside down. There has been a disturbing shift of decision making from the state and local levels to the federal level of government.

It is time to examine the fruits of recent experience, to place the positive results in proper perspective, and to offer constructive alternatives to the present approach to federal financing of education.

Why?

What were the conditions that led to the present state of federal participation in financing education? To name the chief ones will help one to understand the present dilemma and to see the logic of the alternative to be described later.

The most fundamental fact to consider is the progressive income tax system which the federal government has developed. This is perhaps the most powerful fiscal system that any national government has ever devised. The power of Congress under the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution to levy taxes for any purpose deemed in the national welfare, coupled with the power to budget expenditures and to control the supply of money and credit, gives the federal government the essential tools for responsible leadership in the maintenance of a healthy economy.

The states have relatively weak tax systems. They rely mainly on sales and property taxes, both of which are regressive in character. In theory they could utilize a progressive income tax to go far toward balancing the equity of the total system. While two-thirds of the states have a state income tax, none uses this form extensively for two logical reasons. First, no state wants to get very far out ahead of others for fear of adverse business effects. Second, the concentration and complexity of economic activity would make a large amount of tax avoidance possible unless all states levied a uniform tax.

Thus, the states have the responsibility for education and the expenditure need but inadequate tax systems. The federal government has the only tax system which can tap the national economy as equitably as can be devised. This gap between the fiscal power to raise revenue on the one hand and the expenditure need on the other constitutes the basis for federal participation in financing education.

A number of forces gained momentum in recent years to increase the costs of education faster than revenue potential. For a time the birth rate increased faster than state and local tax bases. The farm revolution sent millions of persons to the cities. This movement accelerated the flight of big-city dwellers to the suburbs. These changes occurred at a time when most

---

This article, "Financing Education at the Federal Level," was prepared for *The School Administrator* by William P. McLure, director, Bureau of Educational Research, and professor of educational administration, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois. It is the sixth in a series of nine essays on the general subject, "Federal Policy and the Public Schools."

states failed to make commensurate changes in the organizational structure of their school systems, their local tax systems, county governments, and other agencies of government. Thus, states have not put their houses in order to administer adequately and economically the modern needs of government.

These needs have not gone unnoticed by educators, students of government, and economists. The shelves of libraries are heavy with reports of studies on all of these problems. Many members and groups of the educational profession, for example, have proclaimed repeatedly the needs of various educational improvements to the public at large, to state legislatures, and to the Congress of the United States.

Sputnik should have come as no surprise to any student of American education. It caused panic among some leaders in education and government. It precipitated federal fiscal policies which under other circumstances might have been different. The long, deliberative route of pursuing general aid, with roadblocks of opposition from private and parochial schools and other sources, was abandoned. Instead the action was based on categorical aid, an approach which some of the ardent opponents finally accepted in the hope that this method would be followed only temporarily.

Categorical Aids

There are some gains from the recently expanded program of special aids. Perhaps most important of all, the program is highlighting the complexity of needs of the schools. It should be amply clear by now that there has been a tendency in recent years to oversimplify education. There has been too much tendency to find simple answers to very complex problems. Recent events may have aroused a public awareness of the size of the educational task facing this nation. There is evidence coming to indicate that citizens are beginning to understand the inadequacies in tax structures, local school districts, archaic intermediate districts, the multiplicity of educational agencies at the state level, lack of highly talented teachers, and shortages of facilities as they take advantage of federal funds.

There are dangers of continuing these procedures with myriads of categorical aids beyond a temporary period of stimulation and exploration that also are becoming apparent. The dangers are very real and deep. Some of the most serious ones are as follows:

- Categorical aids have a divisive effect on the profession. They arbitrarily elevate particular instructional fields and services and thus directly downgrade other fields of equal validity and value. They proliferate programs and build structures that are difficult to change. Staff members are divided into special-interest groups which inevitably develop insular tendencies.
- They reduce the rigor of choice among alternatives. Surplus equipment from special grants is all too frequently found because of "making the most of the opportunity while it is available."
- An inordinate amount of professional time is required to prepare proposals and evaluations to meet the guidelines of decision makers outside the system.
- They restrict the freedom of cooperation within school systems. For example, the teachers of language arts may contribute as much, if not more, to the vocational competence of a high school graduate than the teachers of "vocational" courses. To put the latter on special salary schedules with other perquisites and to deny these to the former is difficult to justify to the persons intimately involved.
- They oversimplify by spurious definitions programs and services in the "national interest." Just what values are there in educational programs and services that contribute to the development of every individual that are not in the national interest?
- They hinder the development of rational emphases in education. Educational purposes have to be defined in functional components known as instructional fields and services. Changes and adaptations should result from indigenous needs and requirements based upon the best and widest use of human intelligence in society rather than from decisions of a few administrative agents of government.
- By their nature they require a system of external control that is antithetic to American values of government and to psychological principles of effective human behavior.
- These disadvantages likewise overshadow advantages of categorical aids to institutions of higher education.

General Aids

General aids have far more advantages than categorical aids as a means for distributing federally collected revenues to school systems. Some of the chief advantages are:

★ They promote a more defensible system of control and administrative responsibility to pursue educational objectives worthy of a free society.

★ They promote an intellectual disposition of creativity rather than compliance.

★ They strengthen the capacity of local school systems to study, to plan, to take responsible action, and to evaluate.

★ Certainty and stability of support are more easily assured than is possible to establish for special aids.

★ General funds are more suitable to tie school support to the economic capacity of the nation. School systems need the fiscal capacity that permits flexibility to cope with fluctuations in the composition of the school population and the attendant educational requirements.

★ School systems are responsive, if not arbitrarily handicapped, to the basic drive of the American people for excellence. The oft-repeated question of political leaders, "Can we be sure that the funds will yield the best educational results?" is certainly legitimate. But it deserves to be answered adequately rather than to be used rhetorically.

The Alternative

There are responsible scholars and leaders in education, as in other fields

of endeavor, who believe that there is overwhelming evidence in the experience of public education in America to favor the superiority of general federal funds over categorical aids for education. This idea is an old one, dating back at least a half century. The first classic statement of basic theory and operational structure to describe this idea was made by the late Professor Paul R. Mort in 1936 in *Federal Support for Public Education*. Since that time there have been any number of proposals embodying the same basic idea with variations in structural detail. A recent advocate with national recognition is Walter W. Heller, former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers to the late President Kennedy and during one year of President Johnson's administration. He has championed general funds in the form of shared revenues rather than general grants-in-aid.

Proponents of general aid believe that this type of support can be devised to accomplish the best that is known about federal-state-local relations in the governance of education; the soundest fiscal policy; the greatest degree of adaptability of the school system to future needs of every individual and society; the soundest principles to promote creativity, scholarship, and responsibility among teachers and other educational leaders; and the safest principle to ensure the highest quality of education.

This idea has been expressed in two forms: (1) general grant-in-aid, and (2) tax or revenue sharing. The author prefers the latter because it comes closer to expressing the fundamental role of the federal government; namely, to restrict its action to purely fiscal relationships with the states. Tax sharing would serve as the means to gear a basic support of education to the total economy of the nation. The states would be responsible for administering the schools and providing additional support from state and local taxes. Each state would have responsibility for developing a fiscal structure with refinements to meet various adjustments, including the extra costs in cities of dense population and the most sparse areas, equity among districts of variable local taxable wealth, incentives to improve local district structure, and other factors. The fiscal structure of each state should encompass the funds collected from all levels of government.

The alternative proposal for federal financing would be as follows:

- Definition of educational revenues into large blocks: (1) elementary and secondary schools, and (2) higher education.
- Gradual consolidation of present categorical aids and transfer of most of them to general payments after a specified date. Exceptions would be a few special aids such as GI educational scholarships, payments in lieu of local property taxes in federally impacted areas, educational programs in the armed forces, and other similar functions best centralized in the federal government.
- Designation of a given percentage of the total federal income tax collections to be distributed to the states for education. The federal government could prorate the funds between elementary and secondary schools and higher education, or it could leave this decision to the state legislatures. (Heller has an excellent suggestion for a trust account to handle these funds, a mechanism which would take them out of the federal budget and expedite the flow of funds to states.)
- Distribution of educational revenues to the states should be made as follows:

Higher education. Since comparable cost units are virtually nonexistent in higher education, the most feasible basis would be a given percentage of the educational and general expenditures, with a normative overage for capital outlay.

Elementary and secondary schools. The basis for distribution would be one of the following: (a) A given percentage of school expenditures, including expenses of current operation and capital outlay. (b) School-age population if the decision is made to support that portion of education which private and parochial schools may share with the public schools; otherwise pupil membership (enrollment) in the public schools would be used as the distribution unit.

Adjustments in distribution of federal revenues to states. Two adjustments are proposed for revenues to elementary and secondary education. The principles are applicable to higher education, and the same corrections might be applicable to both areas of education. (1) The first one is an adjustment for differences in relative ability of the states. In this case the writer has chosen the index, *average personal income per pupil ages 5-17*. (2) The second one is an adjustment for extra costs necessary in sparse and dense areas. In the former areas schools have extra costs of transportation and some low pupil-staff ratios due to small schools. The large cities constitute the other extreme where a disparate school population with high rates of retardation, emotional maladjustment, and mobility call for extra staff and resources to meet individual needs.

Estimated Adjustments

For many years advocates of general federal aid to education argued for the principle of equalization in relation to the average tax ability of each state. In recent years studies have revealed that the costs of education in the great cities are greater than would be necessary in smaller cities. These extra costs have been referred to as compensatory expenses. They result not from density per se but from fundamental characteristics of the school population such as just mentioned. The extent of these deviate characteristics which cost extra money seems to be greatest in the large cities of greatest density. There are some exceptions in smaller cities, but usually these are suburbs of larger cities. The question has been raised as to whether the extra costs of the great cities, most of which are in the wealthiest states, might not offset the justifiable correction for low wealth.

The writer has explored this question in recent years. The base of reference for estimating extra costs is a city with about 10,000 pupils in 12 grades, composed of a normally distributed school population. Larger size has little if any effect on cost because

of economies of scale. However, there are extra costs that creep into large, densely populated cities when the proportions of retardation and social maladjustment go up. Also, increased land prices and labor rates affect costs of capital outlay.

In some recent studies with 15 of the large cities the writer found a needed correction of 16 percent for identifiable programs and services. He estimated an additional 17 percent for programs in experimental stages, giving a total correction of 33 percent. This is about the limit which he found to be necessary in the most sparse areas in previous studies in West Virginia, New York, Mississippi, and Illinois. Therefore, using these limits, interpolating in between, and aggregating corrections for the school population as it was dispersed in 1965, a correction was computed for each state.

The table in Column 3 shows the density-sparsity correction, the wealth correction, and the net correction for each state.

While the density-sparsity corrections would be substantial in some communities within states, the state averages, when spread over the total school population, are small compared to the needed corrections to adjust for differences in average state ability. According to these estimates, Mississippi would receive $2.32 of federal revenue for each $1 distributed to New York.

Summary

What assurance can the federal government have that the revenues distributed by this proposed procedure will be spent most effectively? The only technical assurance needed is a proper audit certifying that the funds have been spent for the general purpose as designated. In addition, states should be expected to publish reports of far more evaluative rigor than they have prepared in the past. Such reports are needed not merely to justify use of federal funds but as a matter of public responsibility irrespective of sources of financial support. The state of knowledge is reaching the point where comprehensive evaluations of deployment of input resources can be made and related to some dependable data on educational results (benefits). These evaluations can go beyond the current limited and oversimplified approaches to national assessment. Furthermore, the techniques and results can be made a matter of public information so that researchers are challenged to advance the science of evaluation.

What incentive will states have to continue state and local effort to support education? In the past the states of low wealth have made a greater tax effort than states of high wealth. There is no evidence to indicate that educational aspirations in any state will decline. The demands for improvements of various kinds are so great that there is no foreseeable reduction in educational costs. An increase in federal funds would permit many communities at high tax-effort levels to slow down the rate of increase in local tax burden. This condition would permit some local tax relief in efforts to reach educational goals, but not reduction except in rare instances.

What should be the limits of federal participation? The goal should be to establish an axiomatic level of support that would be modified as often as necessary to keep the states of lowest wealth within reach of an adequate level of expenditure after placing a reasonable burden on state and local tax sources.

Would this general tax-sharing plan call for some means of communication between the policy-making agencies of state and federal governments? It would seem that some means of communication are needed. At present they appear to be working independently, if not competitively, in some instances.

CORRECTIONS FOR DENSITY-SPARSITY-WEALTH

State	Density-Sparsity Correction	Wealth* Ratio 1965	Net Correction
Alabama	12%	2.05	1.85
Alaska	24	1.17	1.21
Arizona	19	1.66	1.58
Arkansas	17	2.00	1.85
California	14	1.08	1.04
Colorado	18	1.40	1.35
Connecticut	3	1.02	.90
Delaware	4	1.10	.98
Florida	11	1.40	1.29
Georgia	12	1.75	1.60
Hawaii	13	1.34	1.26
Idaho	20	1.68	1.61
Illinois	15	1.07	1.04
Indiana	6	1.32	1.18
Iowa	14	1.39	1.31
Kansas	16	1.38	1.32
Kentucky	11	1.86	1.69
Louisiana	13	1.94	1.77
Maine	15	1.63	1.52
Maryland	8	1.23	1.21
Massachusetts	5	1.12	1.00
Michigan	12	1.27	1.19
Minnesota	15	1.44	1.36
Mississippi	14	2.58	2.32
Missouri	16	1.32	1.27
Montana	22	1.62	1.57
Nebraska	19	1.40	1.36
Nevada	14	1.05	1.01
New Hampshire	10	1.40	1.28
New Jersey	3	1.05	.92
New Mexico	18	1.98	1.85
New York	17	1.00	1.00
North Carolina	7	1.88	1.67
North Dakota	22	1.74	1.67
Ohio	7	1.33	1.20
Oklahoma	17	1.57	1.49
Oregon	20	1.30	1.28
Pennsylvania	9	1.29	1.09
Rhode Island	4	1.20	1.06
South Carolina	7	2.22	1.95
South Dakota	21	1.81	1.73
Tennessee	12	1.84	1.68
Texas	16	1.63	1.44
Utah	18	1.80	1.70
Vermont	16	1.59	1.50
Virginia	9	1.53	1.38
Washington	17	1.28	1.23
West Virginia	9	1.91	1.71
Wisconsin	13	1.38	1.21
Wyoming	22	1.57	1.53
United States	16	1.35	1.29

* Ratio of average personal income per person ages 5-17 in wealthiest state (New York) to the average in each respective state.

Note: The author is indebted to Robert Carey, Louis Audi, and Jack Marcussen, research assistants, for their assistance in making these computations.

March 15, 1967
Number Seven

The impact of federal involvement in education on significant social issues has been felt increasingly in the last decade across the United States. It has become a key subject of discussion among all persons interested in education and ranks high on the list in social conversations among the general citizenry. Today it appears doubtful that such significant legislation for education progress would have been possible had the national government not seen the potential for impact on the significant social issues of our time.

To give a basis for evaluation, the author is adding to the title the already implied phrase, "in relation to the public schools," and is using his own list of significant social issues. These limitations are in keeping with the knowledge and experience of a former superintendent of schools who, although away from the heat of the kitchen a short time, still has the odor of the cooking from eight years' experience in a fairly typical American city.

The old hand at school administration has seen his lifelong interest—education—move from bland mention on the inside pages of newspapers to screaming headlines on the front page, with public debate in nearly every magazine and a stream of white papers on such new subjects as educational television.

Sputnik, the civil rights revolution, and an educationally oriented series of Presidents have made education a key domestic political issue at national, state, and local levels. Moreover, public attitudes now allow for ever-increasing governmental involvement in education; politicians at all levels have found a positive view on improving education valuable at election time. In fact, education itself has become a significant social issue.

For this reason, it heads the list of social issues discussed here. They are: quality of education, equality of educational opportunity, education for the world of work, relationships between public and parochial schools, education and the elimination of poverty, state and local government structures, schools as an instrument for social change, and locus of educational decision making.

One might first raise the question, Does the federal government now have some unusual insight which causes it to deal with social issues long avoided at state and local levels? The national government, by its very function, is sensitive to our country's competitive position in the world and the image the actions of its citizens create. Survival by brute force may have worked before atomic bombs; now persuasion, influence, and world opinion have a profound effect on our security.

In addition, the federal government has money and distance from the citizens; state and local politicians have fewer constituents and thus are closer to the voters. So it is correspondingly more difficult for the state and local politicians to deal with difficult social issues.

The selective process no doubt gives us more capable men and women in the Congress than in public service at state and local levels. As with the blind man and the elephant, state and local politicians and educators frequently see only a small part of social needs, but individuals who have traveled widely understand the marked differences in our country—the ranges in quality of education—and see the needs of the future more clearly.

Quality of Education. Most citizens in the 25,000 U.S. school districts are satisfied with their educational programs or we would know about it. Yet, we know there is great range in quality. Thousands of children are not getting the quality education necessary for tomorrow's world. How do we get the public in communities with inferior

---

This article, "The Impact of Federal Involvement in Education on Significant Social Issues," was prepared for *The School Administrator* by Wendell H. Pierce, executive director, Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colorado. It is the seventh in a series of nine essays on the general subject, "Federal Policy and the Public Schools."

education to recognize the limitations of their schools?

The new federal education legislation, with its influence on mass media, is affecting public opinion by calling attention to the achievements and limitations of specific educational programs. In requiring local community development of a program to meet the needs under Titles I and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the new laws force planning sometimes neglected.

Yet the impact of the federal government's program is not consistent, amounts of money are uncertain, and the specific help offered may be incompatible with current needs of a school system.

Equality of Educational Opportunity. That the federal government has had an impact in the area of equality of educational opportunity no one will deny. It has certainly made the public conscious of inequities. In terms of long-range solutions, its effectiveness might well be questioned. A national attempt to influence thousands of school systems has limitations.

Ways other than the use of the club or carrot of federal aid must be found to help the local community live up to the responsibility of citizens in a democracy. The federal government will need to enlist the continuing help of the states, of educators, and of local school board members if meaningful progress is to be made on this social issue.

So far, there has been less impact in this area than the federal government, or for that matter, I personally, would like. But whatever faults there are certainly do not lie wholly with the federal government. School administrators, especially those in areas where racial minorities are absent or so small as to be invisible, have, whenever they felt they could, hidden their heads in the sand. They have not yet recognized that equality of opportunity is everybody's problem.

Education for World of Work. Faced with a history of education oriented to the college-bound pupil, America must change its view of success. We must learn to recognize and applaud the contributions to our society of the non-college-trained individual. Manpower needs of the future require this as we see the vast appetite business and industry will have for technically qualified, but non-college-trained, personnel.

While the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the National Defense Education Act, and the Economic Opportunity Act have each had a measurable impact, the proliferation of interests and confusion, resulting from lack of unit control and stodginess and ineptitude among federal, state, and local personnel working on this problem, is discouraging. Knowing what to do is not our problem. Carrying out the new programs amidst the red tape required makes the impact of federal legislation in this area less than it should be.

Relationships Between Public, Parochial, and Private Schools. A parent's freedom to choose public, parochial, or private school for his child is a requisite of our American democracy. Such freedom has given strength to this nation. As the cost of education rises, support for nonpublic schools becomes far more difficult.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act has forged new interrelationships between public and nonpublic schools not generally achieved heretofore across the country. While the money expended does not markedly assist the parochial and private schools, it does reach and serve all the children in the proper categories. It has encouraged public and private school people in talking and working together so more wholesome, cooperative relationships will evolve. The impact of federal legislation here has been great.

Education and the Elimination of Poverty. In identifying this problem, federal legislation has rendered a real service. Formerly, school systems frequently were forced to grapple only half-heartedly, or even clandestinely, with the problem of equality in curriculum offering.

Today, many educators realize that equality implies not just the same for all, but special compensation for the limited background brought into the schoolroom by some children. The contribution of paraprofessional workers to the education process has been proved. Early childhood education, given its deserved importance, has served to stimulate better understanding of the poor on the part of educators and the community.

While the new legislation has contributed programs, supported existing research, and opened the door to better understanding, it has fallen far short of the original expectation of eliminating poverty and has not resulted in the cooperative approach so needed.

State and Local Government Structure. State and local governments resent the interference of the federal government in some of these social issues. While they recognize the necessity for change, their progress in restructuring for this change has been slow. Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act furnishes funds to strengthen state departments of education. Marked progress has been made in many states as they have tried to more adequately administer the Act.

Yet, very little of this reorganization progress has helped tackle the urgent social issues mentioned above. In some states almost 80 percent of the funds to finance the state education department is coming from the federal government. States must make an independent commitment, both financially and structurally, and they must have the support and interest of local school districts.

Schools as an Instrument for Social Change. Threats and demands on the part of the federal government and resistance combined with inaction on the parts of local and state education officials have resulted in unnecessary conflict. Schools cannot resist being a part of current society. Schools are in a leadership position, but school systems differ as communities differ.

The greatest weakness of federal activity in dealing with change is to assume that, since right is right, basic alterations of school organization must be immediate. Schools cannot get so

far ahead of the community that they are no longer a part of it. Neither can schools use resistance to progress as an excuse for failing to change. The schools have a gigantic task of educating their communities for change.

Locus of Educational Decision Making. Today, local and state educational authorities must share responsibilities for decision making with their junior partner, the federal government. Some are reluctant to do this. But the federal government has become an active partner in the education enterprise; moreover, it will have increasing influence over education because of the importance of education to the well-being of our citizens and to the security of the nation. Education officials at both the state and local levels should first move to define their programs to meet the needs of society and then influence the federal government in its role.

Who makes the decisions regarding the direction education will move is a major social issue today. This struggle cannot be solved by any one level of government. Machinery must be established to bring about a cooperative approach, and each level must assume its responsibility.

The future of education in the United States must be faced with true humility. William Osler said, "No human being is constituted to know the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth and even the best men must be content with fragments, with partial glimpses, never full fruition."

Our limited view and understanding necessitate courage and determination if we are to make inroads on these significant social issues. And we must recall that whether we are happy or unhappy with the impact of the federal government in education on social issues, it is our government. We have an obligation to see that the democratic process works for the welfare of children—our ultimate objective.

This obligation requires true cooperation between all levels of government interested in education. It requires that we utilize all our resources in research. It requires that we utilize all our wisdom in the development of long-range plans. It requires of us all our skill and patience and knowledge and courage. It requires total commitment. Nothing less will do.

The Commission does not represent a drive for uniformity in American education. It will stimulate diversified answers to the problems in education, recognizing the differences between the states. It will encourage dissent.

The Commission will not lobby inside the states nor in Washington. It will furnish the educational and political leadership of the states with a vehicle to debate goals and answers.

The Commission does not represent an effort to curtail or attack federal aid to education, or federal activity. In fact, it makes provisions for federal cooperation and participation. It is an effort to bring to bear all the resources that the American people have to improve education and to encourage state action for better schools and schooling.

The Commission will not compete with, replace, or make obsolete the current voluntary associations or national and regional organizations in the field of education. It will cooperate fully, assuring that there is a minimum of overlap or duplication. It will seek the frontiers, where effort is needed and recommendations are necessary.

Membership

Membership of the Education Commission of the States, in order of adherence, as of January 1, 1967:

1. Arkansas ..... Legislation
2. Virgin Islands ..... Legislation
3. Hawaii ..... Legislation
4. New Jersey ..... Legislation
5. Minnesota ..... Executive Order
6. Illinois ..... Executive Order
7. Texas ..... Executive Order
8. New Hampshire Executive Order
9. New Mexico ..... Legislation
10. Rhode Island ..... Legislation
11. Oregon ..... Executive Order
12. Ohio ..... Executive Order
13. Idaho ..... Executive Order
14. Utah ..... Executive Order
15. Wyoming ..... Executive Order
16. Washington ..... Executive Order
17. Vermont ..... Executive Order
18. West Virginia ..... Executive Order
19. Kentucky ..... Executive Order
20. Louisiana ..... Executive Order
21. Alaska ..... Legislation
22. Maryland ..... Legislation
23. Oklahoma ..... Executive Order
24. Colorado ..... Executive Order
25. Missouri ..... Executive Order
26. Alabama ..... Executive Order
27. South Carolina ..... Legislation
28. North Dakota ..... Executive Order
29. Iowa ..... Executive Order
30. Delaware ..... Legislation
31. New York ..... Legislation
32. Tennessee ..... Executive Order
33. American Samoa Executive Order
34. Puerto Rico ..... Legislation
35. Wisconsin ..... Legislation
36. Arizona ..... Executive Order
37. California ..... Legislation
38. Georgia ..... Executive Order

For further information, write Education Commission of the States, Suite 822, Lincoln Tower, 1860 Lincoln, Denver, Colorado 80203.

While few public policies are clearly and succinctly stated, those governing the federal financing of educational research and development are more opaque than most. Over the past 10 years new programs have come and gone. Some emphasize development and others quantitative research; some emphasize subject areas while others aim at particular characteristics of children; some years the less sophisticated researcher in local school districts has been appealed to, the next he has been virtually ignored. Even the most highly productive researchers who regularly turn to federal sources for support often are confused about who in the federal government is ready to support what kind of project. If they are baffled, how can a typical school superintendent be expected to understand these policies?

May 1967
Number Eight

The Danger of Unawareness

Nevertheless, he must try. Research and development will increasingly influence our schools and at an ever-accelerated pace. The extent to which school administrators are unaware of what influences the direction of these events is the extent to which they can expect to lose control over what is happening in education and in their own schools. The only alternative is to resist new developments from ignorance.

There are five primary reasons why federal policies for educational research and development are so opaque:

1. The usual federal problem of divided jurisdictions means that, while most of the money for educational research is in the U. S. Office of Education, researchers, especially if they are examining what might be termed the more basic questions of learning, frequently turn to other agencies. It may come as a surprise to many administrators that there is almost as much money at the present time for curriculum development and teacher preparation for new curricula in the National Science Foundation as in the U. S. Office of Education. In the 1967 fiscal year, the Office of Education is authorized to spend $39,800,000 for curriculum projects and teacher training, including NDEA institutes. For similar purposes, the National Science Foundation is authorized $37,350,000.

2. Many policies cannot be stated explicitly because not enough is yet known about the basic concepts of educational research. There is no common agreement on a definition of educational research. For example, is there such a thing as basic research in education, or is all educational research engineering research? Moreover, the term "development" often is used interchangeably with "engineering," and the developer frequently is referred to as the designer. Until such definitions are clarified, no discussion about, say, the proper mix between research and development will be very productive.

The problem is not simply one of definitions, however; there are serious disagreements among those who now influence research and development policies in education at the highest level. The chairman of the education panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee, Jerrold Zacharias, has expressed serious doubts about the present or future value of quantitative evaluations of educational innovations. His views run counter to those prevailing among leaders in educational research.

3. The educational community has hardly raised its voice to demand clarification of these policies. Educational researchers have not been organized so that they could produce reactions in any government agency. The American Educational Research Association (AERA) is considered to be "small" (6,000 members) by Washington standards, and has not exhibited much in-

---

This article, "Giving Direction to Education Through Research and Development," was prepared for *The School Administrator* by Richard A. Dershimer, executive officer, American Educational Research Association, Washington, D. C. It is the eighth in a series of nine essays on the general subject, "Federal Policy and the Public Schools."

terest in federal affairs until recently. The power organizations like the NEA and AASA have shown only spasmodic interest at best.

4. Some major policy documents are not being made public. Two of the most significant developments in education, the regional laboratories and the Title III service centers and programs, were first recommended in a report from a White House panel chaired by John W. Gardner before he became Secretary of the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Many officials who now have the responsibility for administering these programs have never read a detailed rationale for their creation. The secrecy that still surrounds the White House panel report prevents the kind of public debate that could clarify and win support for its original ideas.

There are rumors in Washington that a later report is being prepared by another White House panel. Some Office of Education officials would not be surprised to be confronted, suddenly and without public debate, by decisions that would remove substantial parts of the responsibility for educational research and development to another federal agency. Whether or not these stories are accurate, the suspicions reflect a kind of conditioning to the closeted way some previous decisions about educational research have been made.

5. There is a fifth reason why R & D policies are not clearly stated. Until recently, the Office of Education in general, and the Bureau of Research in particular, has not had a policy-generating mechanism. Many students of education feel that the new office in the Bureau headed by Hendrik Gideonse is a remarkable development for an agency that only a few years ago played a relatively insignificant role in the writing of major legislation. But the increased political value of education, recent pressure from Congresswoman Edith Green's special subcommittee, and the spread of the program planning and budgeting system throughout the federal government have increased concern for more systematic planning in the Office of Education.

To understand how these conditions materialized, it is necessary to reexamine the growth of educational research and development over the past three-quarters of a century. At this point the two terms must be separated because research and development have quite different histories, another fact that helps explain the confusion in terminology.

The early years of educational research are indistinguishable from the roots of educational psychology, psychometrics, and statistics. In fact, it is difficult to say precisely when "educational research" emerged as a distinct field. Soon after the First World War, however, there were three major streams of activities: testing, surveys, and experimental studies.

The testing movement emerged out of the early work of Binet, Thorndike, and Terman, to name but a few; many of the early leaders of educational research like Courtis, Buckingham, and Trabue are best known for their contributions to the knowledge of testing. To many superintendents the terms "testing" and "research" were nearly synonymous and "research bureaus" were actually testing and statistical services. Even today this definition holds in most of the research divisions in school districts.

Surveys

School surveys were used extensively even before World War I and with increasing frequency throughout the first half of the century. In the beginning, they contributed to both substantive and methodological research knowledge as in the New York City survey of 1911 and 1912, when achievement tests were first used. The movement gained such support and favor that research bureaus in universities devoted a considerable portion of their activities to surveys. The problem, as Egon Guba has so eloquently pointed out in his paper delivered at a recent American Educational Research Association-Phi Delta Kappa symposium, was that the surveys became a field service; while they may have been of inestimable assistance to schools, they no longer added much to knowledge about education.

The third category of research, experimental studies in which the researcher intervenes and then attempts to measure the resulting changes in behavior, is often considered the most esoteric to administrators. The experimentalists, most of them psychologists, have had some unique problems of which school administrators are only barely aware.

Recent writings by Sam Sieber, Allen Barton, and David Wilder point out that education, as an intellectual field of study, in recent years has not had a tradition of research. Since the turn of the century, increased enrollments have constantly heightened the need for teachers. Consequently, colleges of education have had to give the highest priority to producing practitioners. Until recently professors of education had to squeeze research out of their own time and funds. According to Wilder, in certain fields like reading, in which there have been a great many experimental studies, the results of this malnutrition are quite apparent. Reading research is characterized by small samples, scant equipment, and manipulation of a small number of variables over short periods of time.

In the eyes of most administrators, the net results of these three thrusts—testing, surveys, and experiments—have been to characterize educational research as a service of unlimited value or as an activity by "ivory tower" professors quite removed from the mainstream of education.

But what about development? In education the term is used most frequently to describe construction of a new course or parts of a course of study. Many of the major curriculum changes were based on very systematic analyses such as the eight-year study chaired by Ralph W. Tyler, and Wrightstone's study. As responsibility for curriculum design was diffused to local school districts, where fewer individuals were trained in evaluation, curricula customarily were revised with little or no pre- or post-evaluation.

Many curriculum innovators have even become antagonistic toward anything except quite loose and subjective assessments. As a result, curriculum developers and supervisors added their weight to the already sizable majority of educators who saw little need to push for more research. Therefore it is not surprising that the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development never worked actively for federal funding of research; their philosophy of improving the total curriculum kept them quite removed from the specialized curriculum programs of the National Science Foundation and the U. S. Office of Education.

How It Began

Regardless of the reason, the educational community did not give a high priority to the establishment of an educational R & D program. How then did it happen? What brought about the Cooperative Research Program of 1954, the Media Research Program under authorization of the National Defense Education Act, the Course Content Improvement Program of the National Science Foundation, and Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965? Each program had different origins and was created in different ways.

The Cooperative Research Program can be attributed largely to former U. S. Commissioner of Education Samuel M. Brownell. He acted largely of his own conviction that research was good for education and not because he was pressured by any group outside the government.

Creation of the Media Research Program, on the other hand, is attributed to the interest of U. S. Senator Lister Hill and Representative Carl Elliott and of the National Audio-Visual Association. The Audiovisual Instructional Service Division (now the Educational Technology Division) of the National Education Association supported the proposal but was handicapped by the ambivalent stand toward the entire Act taken by the NEA, which was still pressing hard at that time for general federal support.

The Course Content Improvement Program, administered by the National Science Foundation, was created as a result of the concern of the advisory board for the Education Division and of NSF Associate Director Harry C. Kelly. Following a lead in a magazine article, the Foundation staff sought out Jerrold Zacharias and encouraged him in his efforts to devise a new high school physics curriculum. Kelly then worked through the American Chemical Society to identify a group of chemists who might sponsor similar reforms in the teaching of chemistry in high school. These were the beginnings of the curriculum reforms that have since affected almost all aspects of the school program.

The several parts of Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act have diverse origins. Actually, this title merely amended the original P.L. 531 of the Cooperative Research Act to enable the federal government (1) to train education researchers and research-related persons, (2) to contract with profit and nonprofit corporations for research and development activities, and (3) to expand the dissemination of research results. But these amendments, coupled with what was for education a drastically increased budget—from $25 million to $60 million—made 1965 a milestone. The number of R & D centers doubled from four to eight, the first nine of twenty regional laboratories were created, and $8 million was appropriated for graduate, undergraduate, and postdoctoral training.

Professional educators had little to do with these innovations. They came, by and large, from the Gardner task force through the White House to Francis Keppel, at that time U. S. Commissioner of Education, who is reported to have said, "We saw the chance to get more money for research, so we took it."

Since three of these four significant events in the federal support of educational R & D occurred with little or no initiative from the educational community, except for a small group organized by Lindley Stiles, is it any wonder that Office of Education and National Science Foundation officials have felt little responsibility toward it? When the Commissioner of Education's chief lieutenant for research, Francis A. J. Ianni, decided to leave, Keppel searched for a new assistant commissioner from industry and turned up R. Louis Bright, a research engineer from Westinghouse with considerable interest in educational technology. For lesser positions, recruiters were urged to stay away from the "establishment." Advisory panels were filled with more representatives from the humanities, the social and behavioral sciences, than ever before. Informal contacts increased between the Office of Education and other government agencies that sponsored research. Soon Bright was announcing that the central staff would be more active in determining priorities, and funds for project ideas originated in the field were decreased proportionately.

What effect these changes in the Office of Education's policies and procedures have had on the field is difficult to say; more time is needed to gain proper perspective. One result is quite apparent, however; educational research has moved and still is moving further away from the school administrator. This is not to say the school superintendents are completely isolated; there have been administrators on many of the advisory panels, beginning with Finis E. Engleman, former executive secretary of AASA, who was appointed to the first R & D committee. As research becomes more specialized, it is inevitable that the general administrator in education, as in all other fields, is going to have a more difficult time keeping up with events.

The Changing Scene

Both the tempo and the character of educational research are changing rapidly. In 1963 the U. S. Office of Education approved 393 research contracts which represented an expenditure of $13,785,000; last year this figure rose to 1,111 for an expenditure of $100,550,000. From his recent study, *The Organization of Educational Research,* Sam Sieber pointed out that proportionately more scholars and re-

searchers from the disciplines are being awarded research grants.

One of the more visible expressions of the growing independence of researchers is the way the American Educational Research Association itself is changing. Once a satellite of AASA and the NEA, it has moved toward greater independence, first by moving its annual meeting away from Atlantic City and most recently by a vote of the Association Council recommending that AERA disaffiliate from the NEA. Membership has grown from a little over 3,000 at the end of 1964 to nearly 6,000, and it may be able to claim more non-educators as members than any other educational organization. As these developments would indicate, the proportion of superintendents has decreased even while the percentage of school specialists has increased.

Education is strongly influenced by an entire generation of administrators who have very limited knowledge of the potential of educational research and development. Even though there have not been any dramatic "breakthroughs" in knowledge, the stereotypes and myths about research no longer apply. The tide is running, and all superintendents should be aware of it. This means that on all levels—national, state, and local—the researcher, that is, the man responsible for gathering and analyzing data, the man who, by that analysis, can add appreciably to information and knowledge, will play an ever more important role in education.

Educational governments will soon face many of the problems caused by the rapid expansion of knowledge that now confront the federal government. For example, how will they finance inservice education programs when the science of learning as well as the content of courses is changing almost yearly? Who will pay for the increased specialization that research inevitably produces? At what level will salary schedules be set when the science of teaching requires teachers to train for as many years as physicians do today?

The problems of control of education will be even more ominous. Imagine a lay local board of education with newspaper knowledge of psychology a few years from now trying to comprehend a presentation by school specialists of new strategies in teaching that will be as complex to the board as descriptions of the chromosomal breakage would be today.

No, research in education and in those branches of the social and behavioral sciences that are concerned with education will not produce miracles and may not even produce "answers" in the near future; but increasingly researchers will uncover valuable evidence that can help educators make better decisions. It only follows that the administrator who can understand and use this knowledge will be farthest ahead. Until school administrators, as a group, more fully understand how research and development will contribute to the improvement of education, it is highly unlikely that they will support the increases that are necessary for R & D to have the kind of impact that it has had in American industry and defense.

June 1967

Number Nine

American education has come under new influences and is headed in new directions, a symptom perhaps of the country's search for new goals in all areas of human endeavor. Yet any conception of national goals and purposes must embrace the goals and interests of people from all walks of life. More specifically, national goals and purposes in education must be related to all levels of government as well as to the needs of all individuals. There is no one scale nor simple set of values with which to measure human fulfillment. Devising a comprehensive evaluation of federal education programs is no less complex. The process involves gathering evidence and comparing the social utility and individual benefits of many interrelated education programs with the costs of those programs.

The first step in the evaluation process is to decide what evidence is needed, and what criteria will be used for assessing the merits of each federal program and the combined effect of all federal programs in the field of education. There are three basic questions that must be answered: (1) Is the purpose of the program worthy and appropriate to the federal government? (2) Are the administrative arrangements effective and conducive to sound federal-state-local relationships? (3) Does the combined effect of all federal programs promote the development of adequate public schools in all states?

Historically, there have been two major efforts to establish criteria for federal programs in education. In 1931 the National Advisory Committee on Education, appointed by President Hoover, issued a report entitled *Federal Relations to Education*. In this report the Committee declared that the American people are justified in using their federal tax system to give financial aid to education in the states, provided they do this in a manner that does not delegate to the federal government any control of the social purposes or specific processes of education. This committee also emphasized that federal funds should be granted to the states to aid education as a whole and not as special grants for the stimulation of particular types of training, and that the federal government should render large "intellectual assistance" to the states in matters of education through scientific research.

This report, issued in 1931 under a Republican Administration, suggests criteria which would be equally applicable today. A few years later, in 1938, a new committee, appointed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, gave its views concerning the role of the federal government in education. The report of the United States Advisory Committee on Education stated that grants should be made available to the states for "all types of current operating expenses for public elementary and secondary schools"; that the states should be permitted to use part of their federal funds for books, transportation, and scholarships for children attending both public and nonpublic schools; and that the American people would rightly object to any attempt to use the federal aid as a means of controlling the content or processes of education in school. Thus the committee appointed by President Roosevelt also favored general-purpose grants without federal control in preference to categorical aids for education.

Despite these announced principles, the distrust of state and local management of public education which characterized the past decade ushered in a period of proliferating federal categorical aids for education. These special programs must now be re-examined and evaluated.

Is the Purpose of Each Program Worthy and Appropriate to the Federal Government? In deciding

---

This article, "Time To Evaluate Federal Education Programs," was prepared for *The School Administrator* by George B. Brain, dean, College of Education, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington, and Erick L. Lindman, acting dean, School of Education, University of California, Los Angeles, California. It is the last in a series of nine essays on the general subject, "Federal Policy and the Public Schools."

what educational purposes are worthy and appropriate for the federal government, first consideration should be given to those educational problems which transcend state lines. Recent events have shown that educational neglect in one state can be a factor in lowering the quality of education in another. Since educational deficiencies cannot be quarantined within state boundaries, educational isolationism practiced by individual states cannot be sound national policy. The federal government clearly has a responsibility to act to strengthen public schools in all states. Only by so doing can a state be protected against the spillover effects of educational neglect in other states. Thus, one worthy and appropriate purpose of federal action is to make general-purpose grants to states to supplement state and local funds and to encourage states to expend for public schools the amounts needed to maintain an adequate basic school program for all children and youth who choose to attend the public schools.

The federal government also has a special responsibility to assist in the education of disadvantaged children. This responsibility has its origins deep in the history of our country, although immediate concern arises partly from the large number of educationally disadvantaged families that have migrated from one state to another in recent years and from the fact that the great cities are unable to meet the educational requirements of their large populations of the disadvantaged without increased state and federal financial aid. Thus, a second worthy and appropriate purpose of federal action is to provide special-purpose grants for compensatory or remedial education to assist states in educating disadvantaged children.

The federal government has increasingly accepted responsibility for reducing unemployment, and Congress has enacted in recent years a number of laws to this end. But unemployment cannot be eliminated without suitable vocational education programs in all states. In order to meet its responsibility for full employment, a worthy and appropriate purpose of federal action is to provide special grants to states for vocational education, including vocational programs for adults.

The chief source of local revenues for public schools is the property tax. The federal government is the largest property owner in the United States and its property is tax exempt. This condition obviously leaves a large gap in the tax base of America's public schools. A worthy and appropriate purpose of federal action is to remedy this gap by making contributions to public schools to compensate for deficiencies in the school tax base resulting from the tax-exempt status of federal property.

In the past the federal government has made contributions for the education of individuals for whom it accepts a special responsibility. The education of native Indian children is a case in point. More recently, contributions have been made for the education of veterans and for Cuban refugees. These obligations have been properly accepted by the federal government. It is, therefore, a worthy and appropriate purpose of federal action to contribute toward the cost of education for veterans and for other individuals for whom the federal government has accepted a special responsibility.

Common to all states is a need to improve education through research and development programs. If each state were to finance all of its own educational research and development, excessive costs or inadequate programs, or both, would be inevitable. Therefore, it is a worthy and appropriate purpose of federal action to finance research and development programs designed to improve the quality of education in all states.

If a federal education program is designed to accomplish one or more of the foregoing six purposes, it should receive a favorable rating under Question 1.

Are the Administrative Arrangements Effective and Conducive to Sound Federal-State-Local Relationships? Worthiness and appropriateness of purpose are not enough. If the federal-state-local partnership is to function to maximum advantage, the assignment of responsibilities to each partner must utilize the special strengths of each while compensating for its weaknesses. Moreover, each partner must perform its duties without interfering unnecessarily with the essential contribution of the two other partners.

Of the many criteria that should govern relationships among and between each level of government, the following appear to be fundamental:

- The historical philosophical basis.
- Educational philosophy—who should determine the educational philosophy and goals.
- Roles, function, and authority of the local and state school boards.
- Fiscal authority and responsibility in relation to the tax structure at all three levels.
- Administrative flexibility.
- The role of the citizen in the formulation of educational policies.
- The welfare of the nation and each individual.
- The standards of equality of opportunity for educational programs and services.
- Basic guidelines for bringing about efficient and effective education.
- The declared and undeclared priorities for governmental and social efficiency.

We must start with a powerful belief in the local control of educational policy and finance. By local control is meant the state structure, with maximum autonomy granted to local governmental units within the state. The federal government should be a full partner in the education process, but its functions should be clearly defined. The full partnership status can be effective only if the federal government acts and reacts in accordance with knowledge of local conditions. This is presently not the case in most instances. The federal government has certain leadership responsibilities in education. Its most important function lies in the matter of equitable redistribution of the national wealth for the support of educational excellence in every hamlet of the nation.

The federal government must be moved away from its regulatory function to a position of general educational leadership. The regulatory func-

tion has expanded primarily because state and local school systems have not assumed in adequate fashion the regulatory function at the state and local levels. Federal leadership within broad limits should be supported, but unreasonable federal regulations should be opposed.

Historically and legally, the state government occupies a central role in the public school partnership. To fulfill this role effectively, the state education system should be a strong one. The state board of education should have full authority in all matters affecting education in the state and should represent proportionately the rural and metropolitan areas of the state. The state department of education should be strengthened to fulfill a specifically defined leadership function, and its information and research services should be expanded and improved so as to allow the minimum of duplication of such services at the local level. Furthermore, if the total public school program is to function effectively, the state must be in a position to coordinate federal programs with state and local programs and to provide needed supervision and direction. For this reason, federal programs should not bypass state governments; instead, federal grants for public schools should be made to state departments of education to be allocated to local schools by them in accordance with state plans. This arrangement not only respects the central role of state governments in the field of education but also avoids excessive growth of the federal bureaucracy.

Over a period of years, states have developed elaborate plans for granting state funds to local school systems. More recently, the federal government has launched a number of categorical-aid programs. Inevitably some of the new federal programs duplicate the purpose of some existing state-aid programs. For example, some states have provided aid to local school districts for compensatory or remedial education. With the recent entrance of the federal government into this field, it may be in the best interest of education for the state to transfer some of its funds to other equally important purposes. To permit such flexibility in the use of state funds, when the federal government and a state grant funds to local school districts for the same or for closely related purposes the federal grant should not be contingent upon continuation of the state grant. Only by preserving the right of the state to adjust its grant program can the state discharge its obligation to the overall education partnership. This does not suggest that the state should reduce its contribution to public education, but that it should have leeway in adapting to changing needs at the state level.

The amounts of federal funds to which individual states or local school districts are entitled should be determined by objective formulas, reducing to a minimum discretionary power of federal officers in the allocation of school funds. Any grant-in-aid program which authorizes federal officers to use broad discretion in allocating school funds among states or local school systems will encourage political favoritism, and another by-product will be the proliferation of expert proposal and justification writers.

In order to promote the efficient use of federal funds and to encourage sound state and local planning, federal contributions should be generally predictable for long-range planning purposes and specifically predictable for year-to-year planning. Effective use of federal grants requires not only planning but also sufficient lead time to recruit personnel and obtain facilities and equipment. Boards of education should know at budget-making time the amount of federal funds they will receive during the ensuing year.

In the interest of effective administration and sound intergovernmental relations, the federal government should avoid having several departments grant funds for the same or closely related public school purposes. At the present time, virtually all federal agencies have a hand in education, and the fragmentation of effort and control is both self-created and confusing. Congress should first recognize the problem and then reorganize and redefine federal agency functions to better coordinate the administration of education programs. The same functional approach should be applied to the state level as well, for here again fragmentation exists, although to a lesser degree. Similarly, the problem touches almost every school community. Numerous groups interested in social action and educational improvement have been spawned almost overnight and are active in reviewing and approving education programs, often without knowledge of the local school system.

The accounting and auditing safeguards for federal grant funds should utilize the procedures that the states require to safeguard their grants to local school systems. Separate accounting and auditing procedures for federal funds should be superimposed on state requirements for local accountability for state and local funds only if the latter are inadequate.

Although in the case of categorical grants the federal government might specify the purpose for which the funds are to be used, great freedom should be allowed to the local school system in selecting the method by which the purpose is to be achieved. This type of operational freedom is necessary if the local partner is to do its job effectively. Here again, we should underscore the joint participation principle in the sharing of certain responsibilities within the clear framework of maximum local control. Of course, there must be an underlying assumption that the leadership of the local school system is able and competent.

A local school district must have an adequately staffed office with very able people giving full-time service to the whole business of local, state, and federal legislation, because the key point is communication. Unless the local districts make known clearly, regularly, and forcefully their beliefs and philosophy, they have no right to criticize federal legislation. The same communications should operate in the matter of guidelines. Too often the guidelines set up to interpret legislation involve more restrictive controls than the legislation itself. Unless they insist on participation in the decision making, local school systems will simply have to accept the decisions made by others. Smaller school systems need to join forces with each other and

to utilize the resources of the state department of education to fulfill this responsibility effectively.

Local and state school systems also need able staff with thorough training and knowledge in the field of fiscal management and analysis.

How might federal-state-local cooperation function? The federal government has declared that every child shall have equal access to the highest quality of public school education. The state department of education should determine, in a close working relationship with local school systems, the fundamental standards for the administration of this federal policy. At the local level, the policy and the standards must be applied, but with special recognition of the unique situations in local school communities. The role of the local school board remains basically unchanged in this arrangement, except that once again able school board membership is assumed. Any conflict between federal policy and state and local policies should be resolved in favor of the state. Control of educational policy and adequate control of educational finance at the state and local levels are imperative.

To ensure that local communities will have a voice in the formulation of educational policy, some procedures such as the following should be encouraged:

- Retain the local autonomy of the local school boards, within specified limits.
- Organize a broadly representative citizens' advisory council under the sponsorship and authority of the local school board.
- Establish a well-organized and properly staffed school information service. This service would regularly, systematically, and thoroughly inform both the staff and the community of educational issues, problems, and progress.
- Examine the operation of the local school board in such matters as time of meetings, location of meetings, and the relationship between the board and the public.

Local citizen participation in policy formulation is analogous to the voting privilege. It must be based on an informed citizenry that recognizes the intimate relationship between the privilege of participation, the right to participate, and the responsibilities inherent in participation. It is quite possible that an inherent weakness of education at the local level is the attitude of local citizens toward education. Local school systems and state departments of education should and must come up with a joint declaration of educational goals and policies.

Does the Combined Effect of All Federal Programs Promote the Development of Adequate Public School Programs in All States? Evaluation of the federal government's activities in the field of education cannot be made by looking only at each individual program; in addition, the combined effect of all programs must be considered.

Serious questions have been raised about the effective operation of federal aid programs. It has been charged that the combined effect of categorical aids has produced confusion, instability, and distortion of educational emphasis. Except for legislation that identifies national problems and appropriates funds for the solution of these problems, Congress should spell out broad rather than narrow educational policy. Policies for instructional services, auxiliary services, and all the basic business of teaching children should be determined by the state in close cooperation with local school units rather than by federal education officials.

Hopefully, the proliferation of small federal grants for special programs and projects in education has run its course and the nation is ready to consolidate these grants into broad programs of continuing support for education. Before this is done, it will be useful to consider new plans for the disbursement of federal funds such as tax-sharing arrangements (the Heller plan), as well as general federal aid for education proposals.

The tax-sharing plan, under which a part of the federal income tax revenues would be returned to the states for general governmental purposes, has certain advantages. It places greater responsibility upon state legislatures, and it does not penalize in any way the state in which a large proportion of children attend parochial schools. Also, most tax-sharing plans are designed to benefit, in addition to education, other important services traditionally rendered by state and local governments, thus improving the total operation of public services.

On the other hand, the tax-sharing plan affords no assurance that states will provide satisfactory programs of public education. To provide such assurance, it may be necessary for the federal government to adopt a general support program in which payments are made to states in proportion to their expenditures for public schools.

Under such a plan, a prescribed percentage of state and local public school expenditures would be multiplied by state matching ratios, computed by dividing the national average per capita income by the per capita income of each state. For example, if the prescribed percentage were 10 percent, then a state in which the income per capita equals the national average would receive a federal grant equal to 10 percent of the amount it raised for public schools from state and local sources. However, a "poor state," in which the income per capita equals one-half of the national average, would receive a federal grant equal to 20 percent of the amount it raised for public schools from state and local tax sources. And a "rich state," in which the income per capita equals twice the national average, would receive a federal grant equal to 5 percent of the amount it raised for public schools from state and local sources. This still would not recognize adequately those states making great effort but with low total expenditures.

The federal responsibility is clear. Without a federal tax-sharing plan or some form of general federal support for the ongoing public school program, there is no assurance that all states can and will develop adequate public school programs. And without the development of adequate public school programs in all states, the federal government falls short of discharging its responsibility to the American people.